DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 681 HE 021 584

TITLE	Notre Dame Report. Special Issue, 87-88.
INSTITUTION	Notre Dame Univ., Ind.
REPORT NO	USPS-7070-8000
PUB DATE	8 Apr 88
NOTE	169p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Notre Dame, Hammes Bookstore, Notre Dame, IN 46556.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Alcoholic Beverages; *Church Related Colleges; College Environment; *College Instruction; Dormitories; Employment Practices; *Family Life; Higher Education; Marriage; *On Campus Students; Parents; *Personnel Policy; Position Papers; Sexuality; Social Environment; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Notre Dame IN

ABSTRACT

Reports of four task forces at the University of Notre Dame are presented concerning: preparation for marriage, family, and other life commitments and personnel policy that affects the family; whole health and the use and abuse of alcohol; the quality of teaching in a research university; and residentiality. Consideration is given to the social environment for graduate and undergraduate students, ways to improve students' understanding of human sexuality, and the following personal and family policy issues: child care; leave for new parents; care of elderly and incapacitated relatives; the tenure probationary period; and flexible working hours, part-time work, and job sharing. For both students and employees, the issues of sexual harassment and homosexuality are considered. Forty-two recommendations are offered by the Task Force on Marriage, Family and Other Life Commitments. Task force recommendations concerning alcohol use include the following topics: providing alcohol, residence halls, football and alumni weekends, and drunkenness. The Task Force on Teaching offers recommendations concerning staffing and initiatives at the university and departmental levels. The residentiality report covers staff positions and roles, support services, the residential environment, women and minorities, handicapped students, and facilities. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296681

notre dame report

special issue

contents

The Report of the Task Force on Marriage, Family, and Other Life Commitments

The Report of the Task Force on Whole Health and the Use and Abuse of Alcohol

The Report of the Task Force on the Quality of Teaching in a Research University

The Report of the Task Force on Residentiality

April 8, 1988

87-88

HE 021 584

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard W. Conkin
Univ of Notre Dame
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notre Dame Report (USPS 7070-8000) is an official publication published fortnightly during the school year, monthly in the summer, by the University of Notre Dame, Department of Public Relations and Information. Second-class postage paid at Notre Dame, Ind. Postmaster: Please send address corrections to: Editor, **Notre Dame Report,** c/o Rm. 415, Administration Building, Notre Dame, IN 46556

© 1988 by the University of Notre Dame, Ind. 46556. All rights reserved.

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Office of the President

Cable Address "Dulac"

April, 1988

Dear Members of the Notre Dame Community,

A year ago four Task Forces were appointed by me, by Provost Timothy O'Meara and by Father David T. Tyson, C.S.C., Vice President for Student Affairs. They were to examine four important areas of University life:

Marriage, Family and Other Life Commitments
Whole Health and the Use and Abuse of Alcohol
The Quality of Teaching in a Research University
Residentiality

I share these studies with you in this special edition of the Notre Dame Report. They are important reading for anyone concerned about our living-and-learning community. It is now the task of myself, Provost O'Meara and Father Tyson to consider carefully the recommendations made in light of resources available to implement them. In determining priorities, we should be grateful for your reactions. Kindly direct your comments to the person to whom the report was made.

In closing I should like to commend the Committees for their excellent work. Many hours--hours that could be spent much more pleasantly--go into this sort of Committee work, resulting in a kind of camaraderie of discursiveness. The larger community is in your debt for the thoughtfulness with which you performed your service.

Again, I encourage your own reactions to the reports.

Cordially,

Edward A. Malloy, csc

(Rev.) Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.
President

THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON MARRIAGE, FAMILY, AND OTHER LIFE COMMITMENTS

Presented to
Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.
President of the University of Notre Dame

March 1988

Acknowledgements

The members of the Task Force on Marriage, Family, and Other Life Commitments wish to extend our sincere thanks to a number of people who have been extremely helpful to us in this endeavor. For her dedication, we wish to acknowledge Nancy J. Benjamin, Career and Placmement Services, who served as our secretary and handled the flood of paper which we generated.

We also want to thank Cathy Nonnenkamp, senior in Arts and Letters, and Stephan Arndt, the Social Science Training Lab, for their help with our surveys. For her assistance in the production of this report, we express our appreciation to Louise Schmaltz, Career and Placement Services. Also contributing their time was the entire staff of the Career and Placement Services office who coded over 1,000 Family Needs Surveys. We are indebted to the twenty senior students who volunteered to conduct our student survey by telephone and to all of the students who took part. For all of their time, support, and cooperation, we want to express our appreciation to the members of the Department of Human Resources. And to all of the members of the Notre Dame community who participated in our Family Needs Survey, we send our heartful thanks for their insightful comments.

Finally, we want to thank our families for their patience and understanding during the past year. We could not have completed our project without their support.

Table of Contents

Page

I The Mission of the Task Force.............................1
- The Original Mandate for the Task Force..............2

II Creating a More Positive Social Environment for Students...5
- Introduction...5
- The Social Environment for Graduate Students.........6
- The Social Environment for Undergraduate Students.......................................9
  - Male/Female Relationships........................9
  - Sexuality..13
- Specific Preparation for Marriage, Family, and Other Life Commitments Programs..................15

III Creating a Work Environment More Supportive of Familial, Parental, and Professional Responsibilities.................................17
- Introduction...17
- Personal and Family Policy Issues..................21
  - Child Care.......................................21
  - Parental Leave...................................24
  - Care of Elderly and Incapacitated Relatives.....................................26
  - The Tenure Clock.................................28
  - Family Sick Leave and Personal Leave...........30
  - Flexible Working Hours, Part-Time Work, and Job Sharing..............................31
  - Michiana Employee Assistance Program for Faculty..................................32
  - Concern for Single Individuals..................33

Page

Male/Female Relationships in the Workplace...........35

IV Policies Relating to Both Students and Those Employed by the University...........38
Introduction...........38
Sexual Harassment...........38
Homosexuality...........40
Nondiscrimination Policies...........43

V Summary of the Recommendations...........45

VI Appendices

Appendix I: Survey of Students...........52
Discussion of Results...........52
Student Survey Instrument...........56
Appendix II: Summary of the Results of the Family Needs Survey...........57
Family Needs Survey Instrument...........62
Selected Written Comments from the Survey...........63
Child Care...........63
Parental Leave...........73
Care of Elderly and Incapacitated Relatives...........77
Flexible Hours, Job Sharing, and Personal Leave...........79
Miscellaneous Comments...........80
Appendix III: Elements of Sexual Harassment by Michele T. Scott, Kent State University...........82

I. The Mission Of The Task Force

An important ingredient of the University's educational ministry is periodic examination of its mission - the fullest possible Christian, Catholic, human education of our students. What does it mean to educate people to be good human beings before God and society, good citizens of the world, at the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century? It is important to examine how the University itself lives out its beliefs and principles through its policies and practices, both for its own health and dignity and as a strong educational influence on our students. If we wish our students, the caretakers of succeeding generations, to hold, cherish, and continue to hand on the values that the University wishes to foster, then the University must embody these values. As is stated in the Bulletin of Information - Undergraduate Programs, 1987-1988, "Throughout the decades men and women of faith have worked at Notre Dame as faculty and staff, teaching with their lives, publicly and privately. And the efforts of these people throughout the years have borne much fruit in the lives of Notre Dame's students, who in turn help shape the lives of others."

What is the atmosphere that the students experience while here? Statistically, the University is predominantly white, male, Roman Catholic, western, middle class; how do others not in those categories fare? Do the students see respect for all people - women as well as men, people of various faiths, members of racial minorities? Do all feel welcome and respected here? Or must we plead guilty to discrimination and prejudice?

How do people who operate the University day-to-day experience their lives here? Do men and women in faculty, administrative, and staff positions treat each other as equals, partners, as they wish to be treated personally and professionally? Do those who are married experience, in the specific case of their own family, that the University values the ideal of the family? Do those who are single feel unvalued, left out?

How can the University better live its ideals and do its job - in formal education, in residential and campus living, as a role model embodying the values it professes, and as an institution attentive to the needs of the community which gives it life?

The Original Mandate for the Task Force

In May 1987 Reverend Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., then President-Elect of the University, appointed the Task Force on Marriage, Family, and Other Life Commitments. The Task Force was given the following mandate and asked to issue a final report with appropriate recommendations by March 15, 1988:

> (1) to examine the educational mission of the University with regard to the preparation of our students for various life commitments, including marriage, family, singleness, and the vowed life -
>
> (2) to evaluate the nature of the male-female interaction among students and also within other work groups on campus -
>
> (3) to review the present support structures available to students, faculty, staff, and administration with regard to marital and parental responsibilities as related to the demands of work and profession -

(4) to propose policy changes that might contribute to a better realization of a sense of community and mutual respect among all segments of the University population.

Serving on the Task Force were the following:

Kitty Arnold (Chairperson), Career and Placement Services
Joanna Branick, Senior undergraduate student
Tracy Carrier, Graduate student
Maureen Gleason, University Libraries
Ann Johnston, University Relations
Mary Ann Roemer, Center for Social Concerns
Kevin Rooney, Office of Undergraduate Admissions
Roland Smith, Center for Educational Opportunity
Edward Trubac, Department of Finance and Business Economics
Eugene Ulrich, Department of Theology
James Wimbiscus, Senior undergraduate student

Also serving on the Task Force during the fall semester were the following:

Rev. David Burrell, C.S.C, Departments of Theology and Philosophy
Teresa Ghilarducci, Department of Economics
Maureen Hallinan, Department of Sociology
Sr. Jeannine Jochman, C.S.C., Rector of Lyons Hall

The Task Force examined the following aspects of Notre Dame life, attempting to assess the situation or problem, determine available resources, and formulate recommendations for improvement.

- The campus social environment for graduate and undergraduate students
- Marriage preparation programs
- Child care issues
- Parental leave
- Care of aged or incapacitated relatives
- The "tenure clock"
- Family sick leave and personal leave
- Alternative work arrangements, such as flexible hours and job sharing
- Michiana Employee Assistance Program
- Concern for single individuals
- Male/female relationships in the workplace
- Sexual harassment
- Homosexuality
- Nondiscrimination policies.

Other areas worthy of examination but exceeding the scope of what the Task Force could accomplish within the allotted time were:

- Issues unique to single parents
- Salary equity and the issue of comparable worth
- AIDS education
- Gender-based differential treatment in the classroom
- Factors influencing the development of student attitudes and values about family and work.

II. Creating a More Positive Social Environment for Students

Introduction

By the time an individual reaches eighteen years of age, many attitudes and values about marriage, family, and career are deeply ingrained. For young adults attending college, however, these years are particularly important ones because this is the period during which they seriously question and test their values and attitudes in a living situation apart from strong parental influence.

The results of the survey of students conducted by the Task Force and many conversations with undergraduates, graduate students, and alumni lead us to believe that the social environment on our campus should be improved. We found evidence of sex stereotyping, sexual harassment, and date rape. In addition, there is widespread agreement that human sexuality, an important developmental concern for students, is largely a taboo topic for serious conversation at Notre Dame.

While the difficulties mentioned above find their roots in American society, Notre Dame can better fulfill its educational mission by addressing the problems that exist in the campus social environment.

This section of the report examines the current social environment for both graduate and undergraduate students and makes recommendations for ways to improve student social relationships and their understanding of human sexuality. This, we hope, will provide them with a good basis for success in their own marriages and other life commitments.

The Social Environment for Graduate Students

Based on conversations with our graduate students, we conclude that many of them believe that their social environment is not a positive one and that it does not help them to alleviate the normal stress encountered during graduate or professional study, let alone prepare them for successful marriages and other life commitments. The law students seem to have a better social environment because the Law School has a separate physical facility and faculty. Like the law students, MBAs are more numerous than graduate students in other programs and become their own social group. For the purposes of this report, "graduate students" will be used to include all post-baccalaureate students at Notre Dame because our recommendations would benefit all of them.

Despite the presence of four colleges and universities, South Bend/Mishawaka has few of the amenities of a college town. As a result, graduate students believe they must look for social opportunities on campus. They are frustrated, however, because campus life appears to them to exist solely for the benefit of the undergraduates. As a result, they do not feel that they are full members of the campus community.

Specific examples of graduate student frustrations are the following:

- They do not receive a comprehensive orientation to the University including all that is available to them beyond their departments and libraries.

- There are few opportunities to meet graduate students from other departments or programs.

- Even though they patronize the food services in LaFortune Student Center, they believe that the building "belongs" to the undergraduates.

- Parietal hours for on-campus graduate students and the disheartening decision to end the Friday afternoon happy hour at Wilson Commons are policy decisions that disturb graduate students and cause them to believe that Notre Dame lacks interest in their social needs and respect for their maturity.

- They are uncertain as to whether or not campus events and organizations are available to them and, as a result, usually avoid them.

- Limited campus housing for graduate students serves to further alienate them from the daily life of this residential campus.

- Problems with both the availability of food service and the delivery of mail during periods when the undergraduates are away from campus make our graduate students feel like "second class" citizens.

Fr. David Burrell's service as chaplain of University Village has been a great help to the married students who live there. Some unmarried graduate students, however, have expressed a desire for a closer relationship with Campus Ministry and would like to see religious programs designed specifically for their needs.

To improve the social environment for our graduate students, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The University should provide every graduate student with a comprehensive written orientation and reference guide to Notre Dame and the campus services, facilities, events, and organizations available to them.

Recommendation 2: The Director of Student Activities should designate one assistant to work with graduate students to create and promote events of interest to them. Particular attention should be given to the establishment of a social space exclusively for them. In addition, meeting space in LaFortune Student Center should be designated for graduate student use.

Recommendation 3: The Director of Campus Ministry should appoint a chaplain and designate a chapel for graduate students.

Recommendation 4: The University should proceed with an examination of the feasibility of constructing coeducational housing for graduate students.

Recommendation 5: Residents of the current single sex graduate housing should be permitted to choose whether or not they want parietal hours.

Recommendation 6: University offices should provide basic services (food, mail, etc.) year round to accommodate the needs of graduate students.

The Social Environment for Undergraduates

Undergraduates are the largest, youngest, and most visible group within the University. As they question, test, and affirm their values and explore relationships with one another, they need education and support from the rest of the University community. As a formerly all-male institution, now in its 16th year of coeducation, Notre Dame continues to struggle with how to create a healthy social environment for men and women while maintaining its religious values and acknowledging that its students are part of an American society much different from that which existed in 1842, 1942, or even 1972.

Male/Female Relationships

The survey of undergraduates and conversations with them and alumni confirm that some have problems in developing healthy relationships with members of the opposite sex. There are sex stereotypes that seem to be passed from one generation of students to the next within the walls of residence halls, and such stereotypes cause mistrust between some men and women.

What makes this situation especially frustrating is that so many of the stereotypes are based on false perceptions rather than facts. For example, Notre Dame men and women are no more or less physically attractive and mature than their peers at other private universities; they have virtually identical academic ability even though a disproportionate number of men are admitted; and fewer than one-third of our students come from single-sex Catholic high schools.

Beyond the misleading stereotypes, there are some painful problems that must be addressed. One is an attitude of male superiority fostered by some Notre Dame traditions and reflected in the preponderance of males in positions of authority. This attitude creates a climate in which jokes about women's physical appearance and eating habits become part of the accepted male behavior on campus. As a result, verbal sexual harassment is widespread, and females are ridiculed for objecting to it. In light of the incidence of eating disorders among women at Notre Dame, undergraduate men should strive to create a more supportive, accepting atmosphere for their female classmates.

Some male students are socially intimidated by the unfavorable male/female ratio and channel their social lives into the less threatening environment of their all-male residence halls. They do this instead of pursuing opportunities for informal relationships through campus organizations and events.

The limited number of typical college town "places to go" puts a great strain on the social resources of the campus, and the single-sex residence halls, with their obvious physical limitations, are not equipped to fill the void. The fact that many students, especially men, equate a satisfactory social event with the consumption of alcohol exacerbates the situation because drinking often produces unacceptable social behavior. From our observations, we believe that there is an undeniable need for more creative approaches to social activities.

As is true at many universities, concern about being sidetracked from career achievements creates a wariness about steady dating and romantic relationships. The infamous "ratio" and the limited number of "places to go" with a date on campus further strain the dating picture.

Saint Mary's College students bring the actual female/male ratio on the two campuses close to even, but there do not seem to be many opportunities for them to develop informal relationships with male and female Notre Dame undergraduates. Derogatory stereotyping of Saint Mary's women is another troublesome aspect of the campus social environment.

To improve the social environment for undergraduates so that their years at Notre Dame will better prepare them for success in their future life commitments, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 7: The University should strive to achieve a sex-blind admission process. This would be done as a clear sign that Notre Dame welcomes women to the educational opportunities that exist here.

Recommendation 8: The University should examine all institutional policies and services to determine if sex-based inequalities exist and then make the changes necessary to eliminate those inequalities.

Recommendation 9: The University should create some form of coeducational residence living arrangement to improve male/female relationships among undergraduates and to decrease sex stereotyping.

Recommendation 10: The President should charge student groups, working in conjunction with the Offices of Student Activities and Alcohol and Drug

Education, to promote more creative, non-alcoholic events and coeducational programs. In addition, the Hall Presidents' Council should work to increase joint sponsorship of such programs and activities between men's and women's residence halls.

Recommendation 11: Campus clubs and all student organizations involved in planning and implementing activities aimed at increasing social interaction between men and women students should work towards a greater inclusion of Saint Mary's College students.

Recommendation 12: The Hall Presidents' Council and the Office of Residence Life should encourage participation of faculty and staff members in residence hall activities, perhaps through an expanded "hall fellow" program.

Recommendation 13: The Athletic Department should put greater emphasis on coeducational non-varsity sports that provide graduate and undergraduate students with the opportunity for informal social interaction.

Sexuality

Notre Dame's history, traditions, and policies have contributed to a campus atmosphere in which serious public discussions of sexuality rarely occur. This year the University Counseling Center, the Office of Campus Ministry, and The Observer have made some positive efforts to address certain sexuality issues and related problems such as intolerance and eating disorders. Nevertheless, there is currently no systematic approach to educating undergraduates about these issues which will affect them as they consider marriage and other life commitments.

Can we afford to pretend that incidents of sexual harassment and date rape do not occur here? (See Appendix I for a discussion of the results of the Student Survey and data relating to sexual harassment, date rape, homosexuality, and sexual experimentation among students.) Can we allow undergraduates, some of whom are already sexually active, to spend their years with us without presenting them with serious discussions of sexual ethics and informative presentations about AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases? Can we ignore the fact that homosexual persons feel ostracized if they are open about their efforts to understand their sexuality? If we are serious about educating students, then we must not avoid the basic issues of human sexuality. Therefore, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 14: The Office of Student Affairs, the Office of Residence Life, Freshman Year of Studies, the Office of Campus Ministry, the University Counseling Center, the Department of Physical Education, and the R.O.T.C. detachments should begin a cooperative program to insure that every freshman receive presentations on sexual ethics, sexual harassment, date rape, positive male/female relationships, homosexuality, information on AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, responsible use of alcohol, eating disorders, legal responsibilities of students, and other relevant issues. These sessions should be presented as a part of the normal fall semester for all freshmen including varsity athletes and R.O.T.C. students.

Recommendation 15: Residence hall staff should be sufficiently trained in the topics listed in the previous recommendation so that they can facilitate a continuing discussion of these topics.

Recommendation 16: The University should sponsor an annual Sexuality Awareness month that will call attention to and promote discussion of all types of human sexuality issues.

Specific Preparation for Marriage, Family, and Other Life Commitments

Many graduate and undergraduate students have a strong interest in learning more about marriage, balancing careers and family, and life as a single person pursuing a career or vocation. Some students become engaged prior to graduation and benefit from the excellent marriage preparation opportunities available through the Office of Campus Ministry. There are, however, limited opportunities for those who are not engaged and those who wish to consider an unmarried life. Yet, both groups need some preparation for their life commitments. In addition, there do not appear to be opportunities for those who are not Catholic to explore their religious values on these and other topics.

To assist all students who want and need special preparation for marriage and other life commitments, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 17: The Office of Campus Ministry should develop programs about marriage appropriate for students who are not currently engaged. Further, they should add programs to explore singleness.

Recommendation 18: The Alumni Association should begin an annual series of presentations designed to cover the variety of ways in which our graduates attempt to balance their life commitments.

Recommendation 19: The Office of Campus Ministry should explore additional ways of meeting the religious needs of those who are not Catholic to support their spiritual and ethical development during their years at Notre Dame.

III. Creating a Work Environment More Supportive of Familial, Parental, and Professional Responsibilities

Introduction

In the previous section, we focused on issues which relate to students and the creation of a more positive social environment as a necessary element in their personal growth and development. Here we will address those issues of concern to another part of the Notre Dame community, its employees.

As was stated in the introduction, our mission includes the investigation of male/female relationships in work groups and the examination of present support structures available to faculty, staff, and administration with regard to marital and parental responsibilities. There is no question that the University community is concerned in the broadest sense about the well-being of every member. Some may question, however, why Notre Dame as an employer should take a more active role in the care of children of working mothers or offer a new mother and father time off from work. After all, employees have managed to feed, clothe, and care for their children previously without the assistance of Notre Dame. Is it not the individual's choice to work and to bring children into the world? How can we discriminate against those who are single or who are married but have no children by providing benefits at their expense to others?

While there will always be questions about the equity of the family-related programs endorsed in this report, our research has convinced us that Notre Dame must address the issues which relate to families and the balancing of one's professional and personal life. The University is a part of the revolutionary changes which are taking place in the American workplace. Not to address these drastic changes is to fall back, not just to stand still as an institution.

There are some startling statistics published in Work and Family: A Changing Dynamic* which forcefully illustrate the breadth of the family and work problems we now face as a nation.

> Nearly 60 percent of the mothers of children under age 18 were employed in the fourth quarter of 1985.
>
> The Bureau of Labor Statistics

> Within the last decade, the labor force participation rate for married women with children under one year of age increased 70 percent.
>
> Professors Sheila Kamerman and Alfred Kahn,
> Columbia University

> By 1995, more than 80 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 44 are expected to be working.
>
> U.S. Department of Labor

> Fifty-two percent of women over age 30 in June 1984 who reported to a Census Bureau survey that they had given birth during the previous 12 months were in the labor force as of the survey date.
>
> Census Bureau

---

* Bureau of National Affairs. 1987. Work and Family: A Changing Dynamic. Rockville, MD.

Fewer than 10 percent of our population lives in the "classic" family headed by a single male breadwinner.

Jerome M. Rosow, Work in America Institute

More than half of the children 13 years old and under live in a family with both parents or the only parent present in the work force.

House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families

More than 100 countries, including almost every industrial nation, have laws that protect pregnant workers and allow new mothers a job-protected leave at the time of childbirth with full or partial wage replacements, but the United States does not.

Family Policy Panel of the Economic Policy Council of the UNA-USA

As of October 1985, some 2,500 companies were providing some form of child care assistance. This is a fourfold increase over the 600 in 1982.

The Conference Board

In a survey of more than 1,400 employees aged 30 or older, 20 percent were providing some form of care for elderly relatives or friends.

The Travelers Corporation

Family/marital problems, which include those associated with the conflicts between home and job responsibilities, are in the range of 30 to 35 percent of the caseload of employee assistance programs.

Don Phillips, president of COPE, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Forty-six percent of women with children under age two, and 23 percent of the male counterparts, said child care concerns would influence their decision on whether to accept a promotion.

John Fernandez, author of Child Care and Corporate Productivity

Child care problems force working parents to be off the job a total of about eight days a year.

1985 study by Child Care Systems, Inc.

Information secured by the Task Force suggests that Notre Dame employees do not differ radically from many of the national statistics above. A survey sent to all employees by the Task Force in February 1988 revealed the strong and deeply held conviction on the part of many respondents that Notre Dame must be instrumental in providing child care. Also strongly supported by many respondents are provisions for parental leave and the opportunity for more flexible hours or work arrangements. While many employees were impressed that the University was seeking their opinion about various family issues, there were also frequent references to the rhetoric of the "Notre Dame family" as an empty phrase in the absence of specific family assistance policies and services.

We recognize that nothing is without cost. High quality child care is very expensive, as are many of the types of programs which we are recommending. The mission of the Task Force, however, was not to develop a lengthy financial analysis of various programs but to seek information about the needs of employees, explore how those needs are currently being met, and look at ways in which the University could provide assistance. The experience of other corporate and educational employers has convinced us that by offering programs related to familial and parental responsbilities, Notre Dame will reap the benefits of increased productivity, lower absenteeism, and certainly an enhanced ability to recruit and retain superior staff and faculty. We also fulfill a higher call to support the institution of the family which is under siege in our society today.

Personal and Family Policy Issues

Child Care

The evidence gathered by the Task Force strongly suggests that a large percentage of Notre Dame's employees are committed to fulfilling family and work-related responsibilities and are often troubled when the two conflict. The opinions expressed by faculty, staff, and students indicate that child care is the single most pressing family need. We were impressed not only by the statistical results of the survey, but by the extent to which respondents emphasized the desirability of University assistance for child care in their written comments. (See Appendix II for a discussion of the survey and selected comments.) These comments came from those who saw the negative effect of the lack of good child care on productivity in the units they supervise, from those who spoke of the influence of child care considerations in attracting and retaining faculty and staff, and from those who spoke of their own need for child care.

The range of child care needs is extensive. Individuals described the difficulties in finding infant care, sick child care, and after school and summer care. To some, cost is a heavy burden. Others could pay but could not find a quality facility that met their needs. The Task Force recognizes that it is impossible to solve all of the child care problems of Notre Dame's employees. To determine what the best deployment of resources should be is a complex problem, demanding a more extensive investigation than we could accomplish. It will involve a detailed study of the demographics of the Notre Dame community and a survey of the child care facilities already available in the local area. The study should also include the possibility of cooperative action with other local employers. In weighing the options, the University should be particularly cognizant of the preferences expressed by many of its employees for an on-site facility which would allow them to be closer to their children (particularly important in the case of infants), to feel more confident about the quality of the care their children receive, and perhaps to provide a better way to meet emergency child care needs.

Recommendation 20: The University should assign a high level administrator, with an advisory council composed of representatives of the various categories of employees and students using child care, to develop a long range plan for assisting members of the Notre Dame community in meeting their child care needs. Such a plan should include provision for an on-site facility.

The Task Force and the vast majority of Notre Dame's employees do not believe that the University should assume the total cost of child care. Parents are willing to pay, but the ability to pay for the kind of child care which assumes well-equipped, safe facilities and well-qualified caregivers varies greatly. The number of parents who praised the outstanding program at the Early Childhood Development Center at Saint Mary's College was striking, but such programs are costly and limited in number. Notre Dame should not reduce any contribution it makes to ECDC, but should also be concerned about extending the benefits of good child care to a broader spectrum of the Notre Dame community.

The children of those with lower incomes should not suffer the ill effects of inadequate and even dangerous arrangements. To insure that these children have an opportunity for a good start in life is appropriate, not only because the University benefits from the work and enrollment of their parents, but also because society as a whole has a stake in the well-being of its children. Financial support can take a variety of forms, and the University should study these with an eye to their differential impact on those of various income levels.

For some, the opportunity to set aside a certain amount of their salary for child care through salary reduction (Dependent Care Tax Account) will be advantageous, and this option entails a relatively small investment by the University. Obviously, the benefits will be greater for those in a higher tax bracket, so it should not be the sole form of assistance.

Recommendation 21: The University should make available the Dependent Care Tax Account, accompanied by an informational program which would help employees choose the best plan for their financial situations.

Recommendation 22: Child care should be included in a University flexible benefits program as one of the options available to those individuals who could benefit from such a service.

Recommendation 23: Financial need should be a consideration in developing options for child care assistance by the University.

Parental Leave

The Task Force was convinced from the attitudes revealed by our Family Needs Survey and from viewpoints expressed elsewhere that leave for new parents was a matter of major concern for many on campus. For a number of young married couples among Notre Dame's faculty and staff, the dilemma of simultaneously fulfilling obligations to an infant and to one's job - while retaining health and sanity - seemed almost overwhelming. In response to this problem, an increasing number of companies are adopting formal maternity leave policies, and bills compelling such policies have been introduced before various state legislatures. The Task Force believes that the University should be in the vanguard of those addressing this issue. We see that the number of women returning to work after childbearing is growing at Notre Dame as elsewhere. Men, too, are much more involved with the care of their children.

At present, no specific maternity or paternity leave exists for staff. Staff members having a baby can take whatever long term medical leave is due them, under the usual conditions, and this can be extended by vacation and short term medical leave, with their job guaranteed for sixty calendar days. Faculty members having a baby have four weeks of compensated leave, which can be extended by medical leave up to six months if there are serious complications of childbearing. There are currently no provisions for adoptive parents or for fathers, making the successful bonding of a baby to those parents difficult indeed. The difficulties were eloquently portrayed by respondents, both employees and graduate students, to the Family Needs Survey. (See Appendix II.) We believe, therefore, that the currently allotted time off is totally inadequate for birth mothers and that leave should be provided for reasons beyond medical disability to all new parents.

The Faculty Senate has gathered much information which will aid the University in judging the cost and impact of a parental leave policy for faculty. We commend them for their work and believe that the study has merit.

Recommendation 24: The University should adopt a parental leave policy which:

a. is more generous in paid time off than the present policy for birth mothers,

b. includes some provision for fathers and for adoptive parents,

c. includes a job guarantee for a stated length of time.

Recommendation 25: The University should strive to achieve parity in the application of a parental leave policy to the various categories of employees.

Recommendation 26: The University should investigate ways in which graduate student funding of all types could be administered in a more flexible manner to accommodate the birth of a baby or other familial responsiblities.

Recommendation 27: The University should give serious consideration to the amendment to the Academic Articles on Leave of Absence which was proposed by the Faculty Senate.

Care of Elderly and Incapacitated Relatives

According to the Bureau of National Affairs, as the median age of the population increases, many more employed individuals will have responsibility for the care of an elderly relative. For many of those workers, caring for an elderly person can become the equivalent of a second full-time job.

In studying this issue, the Task Force found that the statement above is true for a significant number of the University's employees. Fourteen percent of the Family Needs Survey respondents reported having responsibility for the care of an elderly or incapacitated relative. Of that number, over 45% indicated that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their present care arrangements. All twenty-nine individuals who took the time to comment wrote in favor of support services provided by the University to address this problem.

Recently, the College Placement Council reported that as with child care, "elder care" can create problems for both workers and their employers. Various sources cite common behavior patterns of employees having elder care responsiblities: tardiness, excessive use of the phone, frequent time off to accompany the relative to medical appointments, and loss of concentration on the job. There is little doubt that tremendous anxiety and guilt are associated with trying to work and care for an incapacitated relative while maintaining a stable home life.

Cost is also a major worry for those providing care, especially for those employees at lower income levels. Professional nursing in-home care can cost $55 per hour. Monthly charges for good quality nursing homes can run $2,000 to $3,000. In some instances, proper care cannot be obtained at all, regardless of the cost.

In response to this growing need, approximately one hundred U.S. corporations have adopted some form of elder care assistance in the past two years. These companies have responded in various ways, ranging from providing group seminars and support groups to publishing resource guides.

The Task Force believes that there is sufficient evidence to support the contention that Notre Dame's employees will assume these responsibilities in ever increasing numbers. It seems prudent and humane to start institutional efforts to soften the effects of this burden on staff and faculty with assistance programs now. We have the good fortune to have members of the Gerontological Education, Research and Services Center among our staff. They could be called upon to lend their expertise in the planning efforts to meet this pressing need.

Earlier in this report, the Task Force recommended that the University offer the Dependent Care Tax Credit program to employees with child care expenses. This same benefit would also be open to employees with elder care responsibilities if the dependent lives in the employee's home at least eight hours per day.

Recommendation 28: The Department of Human Resources, calling upon the expertise of representatives of the GERAS Center, should investigate the creation of support groups and referral services for those with responsibility for the care of elderly or incapacitated relatives.

The Tenure Clock

It is generally agreed that the tenure probationary period of six years for faculty is an enormously stressful time, demanding long hours for teaching and research. Coupling those work demands with childbearing or major medical disabilities is physically and emotionally exhausting. Therefore, many universities are considering extending the tenure probationary period or "tenure clock" by a year to accommodate individuals with these circumstances.

Of specific concern is the overlap of a female faculty member's biological clock with her tenure clock. According to Carolyn Cutrona, quoted in the February 3, 1988 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education, "For women, many of whom (spend their 20's obtaining their PhD's and) begin their academic careers in their early 30's, it is not medically advisable to delay childbearing until after they have been granted tenure. However, caring for an infant indisputably slows scholarly progress." A parental leave policy incorporating a feature that temporarily stops the tenure clock can help meet these legitimate concerns of untenured faculty. The core of this proposal has to do with the University responding to the childrearing obligations of its faculty in a way that recognizes the impact of these obligations on scholarly commitments. Such a policy would also be consistent with the University's goals of improving the quality of its faculty by expanding the candidate pool and increasing the number and proportion of women faculty members.

The Task Force believes that the affected faculty member should have the option of electing whether to stop the tenure clock. That decision should be independent of whether or not the person elects to take a parental leave.

It should be noted that a deferral of the tenure decision would still be possible under leaves of absence granted for incapacitating illness or serious disability as currently specified in the faculty manual.

Recommendation 29: A stopped tenure clock option should be included in the segment of a parental leave policy that pertains to faculty.

Recommendation 30: The decision to stop the tenure clock for up to one year should be made solely by the affected faculty member.

Recommendation 31: The decision to stop the tenure clock should be independent of whether or not the faculty member has opted for a parental leave.

Family Sick Leave and Personal Leave

This issue primarily deals with the difficulties encountered by staff employees when their family members are ill or when they have other compelling personal business. Since Notre Dame does not currently provide either personal leave or family sick leave, employees with sick children are dependent on the understanding and good will of their supervisors. In some cases, those who stay home to care for their sick child feel they must lie to their supervisors by reporting the absence as due to their own illness. A policy that encourages dishonesty in order to meet a parental obligation clearly needs to be modified. One approach would be to adopt a flexible absence policy which recognizes that there are times when employees must take care of a sick family member. Another approach involves the University partially subsidizing the provision of sick child care services. The latter has the advantage of meeting parental concerns while reducing absenteeism. The subsidy would be provided to faculty, staff, and students. Two local hospitals currently offer this service, one at the hospital and the other by sending a nurse to the home.

Recommendation 32: The University should modify current policy to permit the use of sick leave for family as well as personal illness.

Recommendation 33: The University should explore the possiblity of implementing a voucher system that would partially subsidize the cost of sick child care services.

Recommendation 34: The University should provide a limited number of annual paid personal leave days to employees to enable them to handle personal and family matters.

Flexible Working Hours, Part-Time Work, and Job Sharing

The University employs many adjunct faculty who meet specific, short-term departmental needs. In addition, the University has in place a clear set of policies that pertain to the part-time status of regular faculty, including such items as relative pay, tenure procedures, fringe benefits, etc.

With respect to staff employees, there is an emerging preférence for flexible work schedules among current full-time staff employees, especially women with children. Part-time work would enable this group to avoid the "all or nothing" decision about work. In turn, the University could maintain continuity of effort and eliminate hiring and training costs by retaining individuals on reduced work schedules. In addition, crises could be handled by extending the work hours of part-time people rather than overloading full-time personnel. Finally, flextime would widen the pool of talented applicants for University staff positions in situations where circumstances dictate an individual need for flexibility regarding hours and place of work.

Flextime would, of course, be limited to specific job categories. Some jobs demand that an individual be in a specific place at a specific time. Other positions could be structured to meet employee needs without any decline in work performance.

Some departments have the impression that there are awkward administrative barriers to making more flexible work arrangements for their current employees or those they wish to hire. This misapprehension could be reduced by providing information outlining the advantages of alternative arrangements and the procedures to follow when modifying a work schedule.

Recommendation 35: The Department of Human Resources should develop methods which encourage and support departments in offering flextime, job sharing, and part-time employment.

Michiana Employee Assistance Program for Faculty

Notre Dame currently limits participation in the Michiana Employee Assistance Program to staff, providing contracted professional evaluation and referral services to those with personal and family problems. Since faculty are as vulnerable as staff to problems that may affect their job performance, they should be included in the University's program.

Recommendation 36: The University should extend the benefits of the Michiana Employee Assistance Program to the faculty.

Concern for Single Individuals

The Task Force is concerned about the possible effect of the University's emphasis on family issues on those who are single. We do not wish to imply that the needs of single individuals are of little consequence. It has been argued that single persons have even more difficulty in balancing work and personal everyday life because they have no partner with whom to share the emotional and physical burden.

An individual employed by Notre Dame who is single may be divorced, widowed, or never married. That person may be a relgious or a single parent coping with rearing children alone. He or she may be single by choice or by the force of circumstances. We believe that the University must acknowledge the existence of this portion of our employee population more frequently and publicly, and must function in a manner more sensitive to their needs, in the same way it looks to assist those who are married.

There is a sense among some of the single individuals interviewed by the Task Force that they are less welcome to the University community than are their married colleagues. It is primarily through written materials and speeches which emphasize our concern for the family and through unintentional oversights in social occasions that single people develop the perception of being unwelcome.

Many single persons pointed out that society in general is less accepting of singles than couples. They frequently stated that the University probably has no specific role in making their social adjustment more comfortable. They expressed the hope, however, that an emphasis on family concerns would not exclude them from consideration in the development of new policies.

Recommendation 37: The University should be as attentive to the needs of single persons as it is to families in planning activities and social functions in order to foster an atmosphere which welcomes all members of the Notre Dame community.

Male/Female Relationships in the Workplace

For the most part, men and women in today's society appear to have arrived at an uneasy alliance in their workplaces. The popular press often depicts women as wary and skeptical of their acceptance by their male colleagues. According to many members of the University community, Notre Dame is no exception.

To examine the campus perception of male and female relationships, brief telephone interviews were conducted with faculty, staff, and administrators. Unfortunately, Notre Dame was given poor marks for the general climate for women by both males and females. Most women reported that they were personally satisfied within their own departments but were often critical of the campus as a whole. The lack of respect afforded female support staff by male faculty in particular was a common complaint. The more frequent incidence of rude student behavior in classes taught by women compared to those taught by men was cited as an indication of the atmosphere for women. Also mentioned was the small number of women in the higher administrative ranks. That there are so few women in those positions was a clear indication to some that Notre Dame remains a male-dominated institution.

Responses to questions concerning whether they thought men and women were given equal opportunities for consideration in hiring, promotion, salary increases, and tenure for faculty were generally negative. Several stated that they personally knew of a manager or supervisor who had said that because a woman was married and a second income earner in the family, she did not need the promotion or salary increase.

An interesting aspect of the reactions was that the higher the level of the male respondent, the more positive the general perception of the male/female climate. Women at all levels expressed somewhat negative impressions of the campus atmosphere. One possible explanation for this difference is that at a lower rank, one is less likely to express one's true feelings to a superior out of a concern for the negative reaction they might elicit. Women as well as men in less powerful positions probably avoid "rocking the boat." It is not surprising then that men in higher ranking positions perceive the atmosphere differently from others. They may not be obtaining candid reactions from others on which to base their opinions.

"Institutional sexism" was a phrase used to describe the campus atmosphere by one of the male faculty members who was interviewed. Some campus structures which existed before the campus became coeducational remain in place. The resentment of the admission of women has certainly faded, but psychological accommodations are felt to be lacking. The symbols of the University---the Fighting Irishman, scholarly priests, athletic teams recognized for their prowess---all contribute to an environment which communicates a secondary role and importance to women, both students and those employed by the University.

Sex stereotyping (as opposed to the more serious behaviors defined as sexual harassment) and patronizing attitudes toward women were often mentioned. Many women expressed frustration in being addressed in a familiar form, such as "Honey" or "Dear." For the most part, these terms of address or more direct patronizing attitudes are not thought to be conscious efforts to demean. They are, nonetheless, an annoying fact of life for many women at Notre Dame.

Recommendation 38: The University should vigorously pursue a program of affirmative recruitment and promotion of women, along with other protected minorities, to achieve greater representation on the faculty, in administrative ranks, and at the highest levels of University leadership. Further, progress toward the achievement of this institutional commitment should be evaluated annually by the President and other officers of the University.

IV. Policies Relating to Both Students and Those Employed by the University

Introduction

The Task Force identified three issues relevant to our mission which apply to staff and faculty as well as students. We, therefore, created a separate section of our report in which to discuss these broad-based problems.

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a very serious issue which affects both Notre Dame students and employees. By its very nature, it creates a hostile environment which is clearly antithetical to the mission of a Catholic university. The Task Force investigated the incidence of sexual harassment of students in its survey. We found that:

- Fifty percent knew of a student who had been sexually harassed by a fellow student. (This is often referred to as peer harassment.)

- Ten percent knew of a student who had been sexually harassed by a faculty member.

- Over six percent knew of a student who had been sexually harassed by a teaching assistant.

Evidence from a variety of sources revealed that employees are also subjected to sexual harassment.

It should be noted that both men and women may be the victims or perpetrators of sexual harassment. Therefore, any effective policy prohibiting sexual harassment must recognize the various ways in which it can occur. Studies of sexual harassment indicate that this type of behavior is generally an assertion of power, not sexual attraction. Further, an individual perpetrator frequently subjects many people to harassment. Therefore, while we are confident that there are not an extraordinarily large number of individuals who demean others in this way, the existence of only a few is reason enough to take action.

Concern about sexual harassment prompted the Task Force members to investigate how complaints are currently handled. Our conclusion is that complaints, both from students and from employees, are dealt with seriously. We were disturbed, however, by the lack of a specific policy statement prohibiting sexual harassment and the lack of any well-publicized procedure for filing a complaint. It appears likely that incidents frequently go unreported because the victim may fear the ramifications of making a complaint or may not know the appropriate person with whom to register a complaint.

There are other compelling reasons for instituting a policy prohibiting sexual harassment, aside from the simple desire to create a humane, welcoming environment. By promulgating a policy which defines the types of behaviors which are unacceptable and by establishing a formal grievance procedure for the victim, the University strongly discourages the behavior and calls attention to the adverse effects that such behavior can have on both students and employees. It also assists in limiting the University's liability in cases involving allegations of sexual harassment.

Recommendation 39: The University should

a. develop a policy statement which defines and prohibits sexual harassment;
b. develop a formal complaint procedure for students, staff and faculty;
c. and publish both the policy and the complaint procedure in Du Lac and in the faculty and staff handbooks.

Homosexuality

Evidence from many quarters indicates a widespread hostility directed toward homosexual persons. Because the manifestations of the hostility are behaviors which are contrary to the Christian nature of the institution, a change in attitude must be brought about, particularly among our students. Many of our students and others in the University community are ill-informed about homosexuality and are, therefore, unable to look upon homosexual persons in any other context than their sexual orientation. We must develop ways of engaging the community in enlightened discussions of homosexuality and the issues surrounding it in order to bring about an environment which is supportive of all its participants.

A primary psychological task of people in the age bracket of our students is to discover and forge their personal identity, of which sexuality is an essential part. The intolerant atmosphere on campus toward homosexual orientation stunts the personal development of students, heterosexual as well as homosexual.

The Task Force found it important to consult with members of the University Counseling Center, the Office of Campus Ministry, and the residence hall staff to gather information. We invited homosexual persons from the University community to discuss the situation with us, and though no females did, a number of males responded to our invitation. We also included questions relating to homosexuality in the survey of the student body.

Our observations from these sources are:

- There is a crucial distinction between persons of homosexual orientation and homosexual acts, and this distinction is commonly blurred.

- There is widespread ignorance on campus about homosexuality. Furthermore, our student survey revealed that over 90% of the respondents attributed to the student body "non-accepting" or "very non-accepting" attitudes toward homosexuality.

- Homosexual orientation seems to be determined at a very early age and is not something over which one has a choice.

- The average age at which women and men fully discover and come to terms with the fact that they are homosexual is in their twenties.

- A significant percentage of human beings has a homosexual orientation. Everyone reading this report knows and regularly deals with a number of homosexual persons, probably not reflecting about or knowing which persons are homosexual.

- Verbal abuse of homosexual persons is commonplace.

Recommendation 40: The University should formulate and publish a policy statement which addresses the need for an atmosphere of tolerance, respect, and nondiscrimination for all persons without regard to sexual orientation. It should include "sexual orientation" in its formal nondiscrimination policy statements.

Recommendation 41: The University should broaden access to campus meeting places (in addition to the University Counseling Center) and to channels for public notice of meetings for members of the University community interested in discussing issues related to sexuality, including homosexuality.

Nondiscrimination Policies

The University of Notre Dame currently has two written nondiscrimination policies that we were able to obtain. One is written for students and the other for employees. It is always in the best interest of an organization to review its policy statements periodically to determine their viability. Do they adhere to current legal requirements and to the ethical convictions we espouse?

The policy statement published in the Bulletin of Information - Undergraduate Programs, 1987-1988 states,

> "The University of Notre Dame admits students of any race, color, national and ethnic origin to all the rights, privileges, programs, and activities generally accorded or made available to students at the school. It does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national and ethnic origin in administration of its educational policies, admissions policies, scholarship and loan programs, and athletic and other school-administered programs. The University of Notre Dame does not discriminate in admission, or access to, or treatment, or employment in its programs on the basis of handicap."

The Affirmative Action Policy in the Employee Guide most recently published in 1981 states,

> "The University of Notre Dame is dedicated to equal employment opportunity and to the implementation of positive programs designed to assure the prevention of any discriminatory practices, either intentional or inadvertent, with respect to race, color, age, sex or national origin.

The University asserts its right under federal statutes and regulations to be exempted from the nondiscrimination due to religion requirement because of its nature as a Catholic-oriented institution. We are totally committed to full compliance with the letter and spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and Executive Order 11246, as amended. Our commitment is founded on both a deep belief that these laws are firmly rooted in our Constitution and our conviction that they are morally imperative and educationally valuable.

The University is also committed to full compliance with Sec. 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, as to the opportunities for handicapped persons; and to the provisions of the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1972, as to the disabled and able-bodied veterans of the Vietnam conflict."

As is evident from a close reading, the policy statement for students omits sex and religious belief as criteria for nondiscrimination. The Affirmative Action Policy for staff includes sex but specifically states that the University asserts its right to be exempted from nondiscrimination due to religious beliefs. As stated in previous sections, the Task Force endorses a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex in admissions procedures and of nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in relation to students and employees. We believe that it is possible to admit, hire, and promote individuals without regard to their sexual orientation while at the same time maintaining the Catholic nature of the institution.

Recommendation 42: The University should include "sex" and "sexual orientation" as part of its nondiscrimination policies.

V. Summary of the Recommendations

Recommendations from Creating a More Positive Social Environment for Students

1. The University should provide every graduate student with a comprehensive written orientation and reference guide to Notre Dame and the campus services, facilities, events, and organizations available to them.

2. The Director of Student Activities should designate one assistant to work with graduate students to create and promote events of interest to them. Particular attention should be given to the establishment of a social space exclusively for them. In addition, meeting space in LaFortune should be designated for graduate student use.

3. The Director of Campus Ministry should appoint a chaplain and designate a chapel for graduate students.

4. The University should proceed with an examination of the feasibility of constructing coeducational housing for graduate students.

5. Residents of the current single sex graduate housing should be permitted to choose whether or not they want parietal hours.

6. University offices should provide basic services (food, mail, etc.) year round to accommodate the needs of graduate students.

7. The University should strive to achieve a sex blind admission process. This would be done as a clear sign that Notre Dame welcomes women to the educational opportunities that exist here.

8. The University should examine all institutional policies and services to determine if sex-based inequalities exist and then make the changes necessary to eliminate those inequalities.

9. The University should create some form of coeducational residence living arrangement to improve male/female relationships among undergraduates and to decrease sex stereotyping.

10. The President should charge student groups, working in conjunction with the Offices of Student Activities and Alcohol and Drug Education, to promote more creative, non-alcoholic events and coeducational programs. In addition, the Hall Presidents' Council should work to increase joint sponsorship of such programs and activities between men's and women's residence halls.

11. Campus clubs and all student organizations involved in planning and implementing activities aimed at increasing social interaction between men and women students should work towards a greater inclusion of Saint Mary's College students.

12. The Hall Presidents' Council and the Office of Residence Life should encourage participation of faculty and staff members in residence hall activities, perhaps through an expanded "hall fellow" program.

13. The Athletic Department should put greater emphasis on coeducational non-varsity sports that provide graduate and undergraduate students with the opportunity for informal social interaction.

14. The Office of Student Affairs, the Office of Residence Life, Freshman Year of Studies, the Office of Campus Ministry, the University Counseling Center, the Department of Physical Education, and the R.O.T.C. detachments should begin a cooperative program to insure that every freshman receive presentations on sexual ethics, sexual harassment, date rape, positive male/female relationships, homosexuality, information on AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, responsible use of alcohol, eating disorders, legal responsibilities of students, and other relevant issues. These sessions should be presented as a part of the normal fall semester for all freshmen including varsity athletes and R.O.T.C. students.

15. Residence hall staff should be sufficiently trained in the topics listed in the previous recommendation so that they can facilitate a continuing discusson of these topics.

16. The University should sponsor an annual Sexuality Awareness month that will call attention to and promote discussion of all types of human sexuality issues.

17. The Office of Campus Ministry should develop programs about marriage appropriate for students who are not currently engaged. Further, they should add programs to explore singleness.

18. The Alumni Association should begin an annual series of presentations designed to cover the variety of ways in which our graduates attempt to balance their life commitments.

19. The Office of Campus Ministry should explore additional ways of meeting the religious needs of those who are not Catholic to support their spiritual and ethical development during their years at Notre Dame.

Recommendations from Creating a Work Environment More Supportive of Familial, Parental, and Professional Responsibilities

20. The University should assign a high level administrator, with an advisory council composed of representatives of the various categories of employees and students using child care, to develop a long range plan for assisting members of the Notre Dame community in meeting their child care needs. Such a plan should include provision for an on-site facility.

21. The University should make available the Dependent Care Tax Account, accompanied by an informational program which would help employees choose the best plan for their financial situations.

22. Child care should be included in a University flexible benefits program as one of the options available to those individuals who could benefit from such a service.

23. Financial need should be a consideration in developing options for child care assistance by the University.

24. The University should adopt a parental leave policy which:
    a. is more generous in paid time off than the present policy for birth mothers,
    b. includes some provision for fathers and for adoptive parents,
    c. includes a job guarantee for a stated length of time.

25. The University should strive to achieve parity in the application of a parental leave policy to the various categories of employees.

26. The University should investigate ways in which graduate student funding of all types could be administered in a more flexible manner to accommodate the birth of a baby or other familial responsibilities.

27. The University should give serious consideration to the amendment to the Academic Articles on Leave of Absence which was proposed by the Faculty Senate.

28. The Department of Human Resources, calling upon the expertise of representatives of the GERAS Center, should investigate the creation of support groups and referral services for those with responsibility for the care of elderly or incapacitated relatives.

29. A stopped tenure clock option should be included in the segment of a parental leave policy that pertains to faculty.

30. The decision to stop the tenure clock for up to one year should be made solely by the affected faculty member.

31. The decision to stop the tenure clock should be independent of whether or not the faculty member has opted for a parental leave.

32. The University should modify current policy to permit the use of sick leave for family as well as personal illness.

33. The University should explore the possibility of implementing a voucher system that would partially subsidize the cost of sick child care services.

34. The University should provide a limited number of annual paid personal leave days to employees to enable them to handle personal and family matters.

35. The Department of Human Resources should develop methods which encourage and support departments in offering flextime, job sharing, and part-time employment.

36. The University should extend the benefits of the Michiana Employee Assistance Program to the faculty.

37. The University should be as attentive to the needs of single persons as it is to families in planning activities and social functions in order to foster an atmosphere which welcomes all members of the Notre Dame community.

38. The University should vigorously pursue a program of affirmative recruitment and promotion of women, along with other protected minorities, to achieve greater representation on the faculty, in administrative ranks, and at the highest levels of University leadership. Further,

progress toward the achievement of this institutional commitment should be evaluated annually by the President and other officers of the University.

Recommendations from Policies Relating to Both Students and Those Employed by the University

39. The University should:
    a. develop a policy statement which defines and prohibits sexual harassment;
    b. develop a formal complaint procedure for students, staff, and faculty;
    c. and publish both the policy and the complaint procedure in Du Lac and in the faculty and staff handbooks.

40. The University should formulate and publish a policy statement which addresses the need for an atmosphere of tolerance, nondiscrimination, and respect for all persons without regard for sexual orientation. It should include "sexual orientation" in its formal policy statements concerning nondiscrimination.

41. The University should broaden access to campus meeting places (in addition to the University Counseling Center) and to channels for public notice of meetings for members of the University community interested in discussing issues related to sexuality, including homosexuality.

42. The University should include "sex" and "sexual orientation" as part of its nondiscrimination policies.

THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON WHOLE HEALTH AND THE USE AND ABUSE OF ALCOHOL

Presented to
Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.
President of the University of Notre Dame

March 1988

Report of the Task Force on
Whole Health and the Use and Abuse of Alcohol

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE Introduction Page 1

SECTION TWO Background

I. History of Notre Dame's Alcohol Policies Page 3

II. Legal Issues Page 6

III. Alcohol Policies of American Colleges & Universities: A Selective Comparison Page 15

IV. Empirical Findings and Student Initiatives: 1988 Study Page 18

V. Prevention, Education, and Intervention Page 21

SECTION THREE Recommendations

I. Goals Page 24

II. Assumptions Page 24

III. Recommendations
A. Programmatic

1. Education Page 25
2. Wellness Page 27

B. Policy

1. Providing Alcohol Page 28
2. Residence Halls Page 28
3. Drunkenness Page 29
4. Alternative Choices Page 29
5. Football Weekends Page 30
6. Alumni Weekends Page 31
7. Social Alternatives Page 31

IV. Minority Recommendations

A. All-Hall Parties Page 35
B. Tailgaters Page 37

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON WHOLE HEALTH AND THE USE AND ABUSE OF ALCOHOL

SECTION ONE
Introduction

The Task Force on Whole Health and the Use and Abuse of Alcohol was appointed by Father Edward Malloy, C.S.C., in the spring of 1987 and was given a four-part mandate:

1. To examine the issue of the use and abuse of alcohol in the context of contemporary American society, with special attention to the college and university environment;
2. To provide an appropriate frame of reference for the analysis of the ethical, social, personal and legal significance of alcohol use and abuse;
3. To determine the University's educational responsibility with regard to alcohol;
4. To review present University policies concerning the availability and consumption of alcohol as they apply to all segments of the University community.

This report is the result of weekly meetings with task force members, periodic meetings with outside experts from the University and local government, and research and study conducted over the past two semesters. The task force examined the issue of alcohol use at Notre Dame from a variety of perspectives, including the history of the University's alcohol policies, the history of legal issues and decisions related to alcohol use and abuse, the policies of related institutions of higher learning, and the attitudes and behaviors of current students. Finally, the Task Force examined current research in the areas of alcohol-abuse prevention, alcohol education, and intervention with persons who manifest alcohol-related problems. The findings in these areas provide the background for the assumptions and principles which are the basis for our recommendations.

The task force has found significant areas of concern related to the use and abuse of alcohol at Notre Dame. They include:

1. Concern regarding the excessively high proportion of Notre Dame students who drink, drink frequently, and often excessively;
2. Concern regarding the axiom that without alcohol there is no social life;
3. Concern regarding the excessive consumption of alcohol on University property during football weekends, which then too frequently spills out and endangers our surrounding local communities;

4. Concern regarding the conspicuous examples of excessive alcohol consumption presented during Alumni Reunions;
5. Concern regarding the role of the University in relation to violations of state laws pertaining to the possession and use of alcohol by minors.

These concerns lead us to conclude that there is evidence of an alcohol problem at Notre Dame, and that it is a problem affecting our community as a whole not simply one segment of it. All attempts to deal with this problem must, therefore, necessarily address the whole community with consistency in both principle and praxis.

SECTION TWO
Background

I. History of Notre Dame's Alcohol Policies

Notre Dame has made policy statements dealing with the issue of alcohol possession and use since the time of the American Civil War. In 1863, the University simply said that "Intoxicating liquors are absolutely prohibited." (Bulletin, 1863-64) This same absolute prohibition was stated as policy with no changes until the Bulletin of 1906, when the penalty of expulsion was specified as the institutional response to the use of any intoxicating liquors. In 1924-25 the policy was further articulated with the caveat: "bringing intoxicating drink to the university campus (is) punishable by dismissal from the university . . . for the offense of drunkenness . . . expulsion from the university shall be incurred." (Undergraduate Manual)

This two-pronged policy which forbade not only drunkenness but also the possession of alcohol on the campus served the university until the 1930's when it appears further elaboration was needed. In the Student Manual of 1937-38, a distinction is made between both types and times of offenses: a.) suspension for the first offense of "being in a prohibited place, i.e., any place when liquor is sold;" and b.) dismissal for "the use of intoxicating liquor, having it in one's possession, or bringing it onto the campus."

Not until the publication of the 1964-65 Student Guide was the Indiana state law cited in relation to Notre Dame students' use of alcohol. But while the civil authority was invoked for the first time, a 100-year tradition of referencing "drunkenness" was softened to a vocabulary of concern for "over-drinking." Still, through 1967-68, the University continued to forbid the "possession or drinking of intoxicants by any student regardless of age on the university campus" (Student Manual).

Evidently, this prohibition proved to be too stringent for either the times or the enforcement personnel. The following year (1968-69) the Student Manual states ". . . students 21 years of age or more are not required to refrain from using alcoholic beverages, however, all students are specifically forbidden to bring alcoholic beverages on university property or campus living quarters." If a student became intoxicated off-campus, it is unclear from this statement whether or not he would face disciplinary action. However, what is still clear is the absolute prohibition of alcohol possession and use anyplace on the campus, including private rooms in the residence halls.

From 1968 through 1975 the wording of policies pertaining to alcohol possession and use in the Student Manual changed yearly. It seems reasonable to conclude that there was considerable confusion regarding the proper stance of the University in relation to this issue. In 1969-70, the Student Manual considers for the first time, obviously in reference to the state law, the definition of "a public place." The conclusion was that public meant "all areas on campus except rooms in dormitories." However alcohol is still "specifically forbidden" on both University property and "campus living quarters." But by 1972-73 the notion of private became the rationale for permitting alcohol in dormitory rooms. In 1972-73 it was seemingly permitted by the first ommission of prohibition in official policy. By 1974, the permission was explicity stated.

It is clear that there was definitely a significant change in the University's attitude toward students' use of alcohol at least from 1968 on. Toleration of alcohol, in varying degrees, replaced a century long tradition of total prohibition. And with toleration came new problems in both articulation of policy and levels of enforcement. The University continued to enunciate policies which nominally supported the state statutes on alcohol, but in practice chose to ignore the enforcement of its own policies.

The defense of such a position might include reasons such as: 1) it is not the role of the University to enforce state law; 2) students benefit from the opportunity to develop socially acceptable drinking habits within an educational environment; 3) the vast majority of our students come from families and class backgrounds where drinking is acceptable social behavior and a regular part of social activities.

However, a fundamental problem existed and it did not pass unnoticed. By 1974 the policy read: "The use of alcoholic beverages in moderation is accepted at this University," and that use was "restricted to private rooms in the residence halls." Supervisory personnel faced the difficult problem of how to handle consumption by the one-half to three-quarters of the student population that was legally not of drinking age. A straightforward presentation of the problem came in a September 9, 1974 Scholastic article in which a former assistant rector characterized the situation as risk-taking. And the level of risk each rector was willing to tolerate was seemingly left pretty much up to that individual.

There was some evidence of institutional concern. For instance, in a 1974 directive from the Vice President for Student Affairs, rectors are admonished: "Parties are to be confined to private rooms so that any possible consumption of alcohol by minors is not known or should not be known by the hall staff." And a further reminder in the same directive states that "No officials of the University are to give permission nor be involved in those parties." A pervasive attitude of looking the other way when underage drinking was occurring was reinforced by the position openly held at that time by the University's general counsel: "The University was unconcerned with the criminal aspect since the advantages of educating students in disciplined social drinking outweighed the risks involved" (Scholastic, September 9, 1974, p. 25).

State laws continue to be cited in University policies regarding alcohol, but the more important concern in reality appeared to be creating a better social environment for our students. There was the repeated challenge that Notre Dame students must find more creatives ways of socializing, but it would appear that alcohol continued to be the prime ingredient in virtually every social function. The residence halls became "experimental centers" where residence hall staff and students could "further the realization of the hall's educational objectives by working cooperatively to plan and supervise programs in the hall at which students [would] consume alcoholic beverages." (September 24, 1973, Unpublished Report, Office of Student Affairs & SLC. This report served in lieu of a published student manual until November 28th of the 1973-1974 academic year.) Hall rectors were given both responsibility and autonomy in carrying out this task, and the result was, in reality, a wide spectrum of individual policies governing the use of alcohol in the dorms.

In 1984, the final report of The University Committee on the Responsible Use of Alcohol (i.e., the Beauchamp Committee) summarily referred to the point when traditional policy changed: "In 1972, the Administration, while acknowledging the Indiana laws concerning the use of alcohol, approved a policy which allowed for the use of alcoholic beverages in the private rooms of students." It then went on to address itself to the attendant problems of this policy and its implementation. Public drunkenness, violence to persons and property, and inconsistent enforcement were among the major problems identified. While there was then, and is now, seemingly general agreement to propositions abhorring drunkenness and violence, there were, and still are, many differences in desirable methods of enforcement. It would appear that it is still in the areas of general propositions (i.e., a willingness to tolerate drunkenness, and a still ill-defined attitude toward the laws of the state) and implementation of University policy that the greatest needs for change still exist.

II. Legal Issues

A. Historical Development

The laws relating to the use and abuse of alcohol have been as variable as the societies within which they arise. In 1919, the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was enacted, prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors. This was the legal tool urged upon society by a coalition of morally inspired groups wishing to stem the evils of alcohol abuse, evils which were condemned in the Judeo-Christian tradition as early as the Old Testament.

The Eighteenth Amendment, however, proved to be a legal and social disaster. Too large a percentage of the population came from traditions where, like the wedding feast of Cana, moderate use of alcohol was an integral part of festivals, celebrations or social occasions of any kind. These otherwise upstanding citizens regularly violated the law and countenanced the development of a major illegal industry consisting of moonshiners, bootleggers, smugglers, etc. In 1933 the "noble experiment" ended with the passage of the Twenty-first Amendment which repealed the amendment of prohibition and placed the regulation of intoxicating liquors in the hands of the states.

Since the line of demarcation between full adulthood and minors in most states was the age of twenty-one years, the laws and regulations established for the use of alcoholic beverages generally prohibited the sale, purchase or use by minors, i.e. those individuals under twenty-one. In the late 1960s, the social unrest resulting from the Vietnamese war (social unrest led in many instances by activist college students under twenty-one years of age) prompted the passage in 1971 of the Twenty-sixth Amendment to the Constitution conferring upon any citizen of the United States eighteen years or older the right to vote. The conferring of the voting franchise to eighteen-year-olds led in turn to the lowering of the age of majority in many areas of the law, including, in many jurisdictions, the age at which young citizens were permitted to purchase and consume alcoholic beverages. Thirty-one states lowered drinking ages in the early 1970s, mostly from age 21 to either 18 or 19.

In the decade and a half following the Twenty-sixth Amendment however, two parallel trends seemed to become apparent: 1) with alcoholic beverages being legally available to individuals as young as eighteen, there was a large body of evidence accumulating that alcoholic beverages were being obtained and used by an increasing number of even younger members of the community; 2) similarly, an overwhelming body of evidence was implicating alcohol as a contributing cause in an increasing number of accidents, particularly traffic accidents, resulting in death and injury. Moreover, a perception developed that the operation of automobiles by young people who had been drinking was very prevalent and was a major factor in statistical accounts of deaths and injuries on the nation's highways.

Many individual states, acting upon their own initiative, rescinded the liberalizing statutes or regulations that had permitted eighteen-year-olds to drink in an attempt to protect young people from excessive alcohol consumption and to protect the general public from the dangers of youthful driving under the influence. By 1986, only 14 states allowed the drinking of alcoholic beverages before age 21. The federal government joined this trend by passing legislation which directed the Secretary of Transportation to withhold a percentage of federal highway funds from states in which the purchase or public possession of any alcoholic beverage by a person less that twenty-one years was lawful (23 U.S.C. Section 158 [1982 ed.]). The constitutionality of this statute was affirmed by the Supreme Court in 1987, South Dakota v. Dole 107 S.Ct. 2793.

It should not be thought, however, that state legislatures were merely concerned with young people. Society generally was developing a greater concern for substance abuse and its affects on the community, including abusive use of alcohol. Paralleling the broad development of constitutional and statutory law, the development of the common law (wherein the statement of a principle by a judge deciding a particular case serves as precedent to decide cases that follow) was also taking into account the concerns of society regarding alcohol abuse. This development was particularly apparent in the promulgation of those legal principles relating to the financially responsible party in cases of injuries resulting from the imprudent use of alcohol.

At least until the 1800s, it seemed very clear that an intoxicated person had the same duty to act with reasonable care as a sober person had under like circumstances. The existence of intoxication alone did not constitute negligence. Even though the sale to the consumer might have been wrong (i.e. the consumer was an alcoholic, a minor, or in some other manner protected by law), there was the presumption that it was the voluntary consumption and not the sale that was the proximate cause of any injury to the drinker or to third parties. Traditional social mores held the drinker alone to be morally and legally responsible for his or her action. Furthermore, courts generally operated in a constitutional milieu that suggested that the imposition of liability for consequences of drunken behavior could only be imposed on others by action of the legislature.

This legislative action began to appear in the mid-1800s through the advocacy of temperance leaders and the adoption of statutes which contravened traditional common law rules. Adopted in their place were statutes which imposed liability upon commercial, and some non-commercial, suppliers for injuries resulting from the negligent sale of alcoholic beverages. These statutes sometimes imposed liability on other third parties, such as public entities, employers and colleges. Today, forty American states impose liability on providers of alcoholic beverages by virtue of these civil liability or dramshop statutes. ["Dramshop" was at one time synonymous with "barroom." Dramshop statutes were directed at operators of bars and at owners of buildings and premises wherein the operators are tenants. A dramshop act permits an action to be brought by a person injured by an intoxicated person against one who contributed to the intoxication.] Many of these statutory provisions are quite restrictive and some are even protective of suppliers. But notwithstanding these restrictions, the trend in many courts indicates more widespread application of dramshop liability to those who have served alcohol to a minor or to any individual who is already intoxicated.

In other words, as an increasingly large number of individuals suffer alcohol related injuries particularly at the hands of drivers under the influence of alcohol, these individuals are looking to recover financial compensation from parties other than the drinker, i.e. they are attempting to recover compensation from the person or institution who served the drinker, particularly if that drinker was already intoxicated, a minor, or someone else protected by statute or common law. There have been numerous cases which have found the licensee, vendor, purveyor, donor, or institution which controls the premises upon which alcohol is distributed, liable for injuries resulting from negligent alcoholic behavior.

B. Indiana Law

In general, the basic Indiana statutory provisions governing alcohol use, initially enacted in 1853, are stated on page 15 of Du Lac: A Guide to Student Life at Notre Dame, 1986-1988. Two of these criminal statutes, through judicial interpretation, have come to provide the basis for civil liability in Indiana dramshop cases. Indiana courts have consistently held that these criminal statutes establish a civil duty and thereby provide the basis for imposing civil liability for personal injuries and damages resulting from conduct in violation of these statutes. In Elder v. Fischer, 247 Ind., 598 (1966), an unknown employee of a druggist sold alcohol to a minor automobile driver who was subsequently involved in an accident injuring a passenger. The passenger sued the druggist for damages. The Supreme Court of Indiana held that the violation of the Indiana statute which prohibited the sale of intoxicating beverages to minors would constitute negligence per se in a personal injury action. In so holding the Court stated that the statute was designed to protect against more than the immediate and obvious affects of alcohol upon the minors who consumed it.

In Brattain v. Herron, 159 Ind. App. 663 (1974), a sister allowed a minor brother to help himself to alcohol in her home. When the minor was involved in an automobile accident injuring an innocent third party, this party sued the sister for damages. An Indiana appellate court extended civil liability to a private individual who merely made alcoholic beverages available. The court cited Elder for the proposition that a violation of an Indiana statute prohibiting the sale of alcohol to a minor constitutes negligence per se. The court went on to note that:

> any person who gives, provides, or furnishes alcoholic beverages to a minor is in violation of the Statute . . . . We see no distinction between one who sells alcoholic beverages to a minor and one who gives alcoholic beverages to a minor . . . . Thus it is our opinion that any person who violates the Statute as it pertains to a minor can be liable in a civil action for negligence.

In addition, the court in Brattain stated that even though the defendant had not served the liquor to the minor, she was still in violation of the statute because she allowed him to obtain the alcoholic beverages from her refrigerator without making any objection.

An Indiana Appellate Court further extended dramshop liability in Parrett v. LeBamoff, 408 N.E. 2d 1344 (1980). In this case an adult male was killed in an automobile accident after becoming intoxicated at the Green Frog Inn. His wife brought a wrongful death action against the operators of the tavern alleging that they had served her intoxicated husband alcoholic beverages in violation of the Indiana Dramshop Act. The court held that the violation of the statute making it unlawful to furnish alcohol to an intoxicated person imposed a duty which could serve as the basis for a civil action for damages. In Elsperman v. Plump, 446 N.E. 2d 1027 (Ind. App. 1983), the parents of a son who was killed in an automobile collision brought a wrongful death action against a bar and bartender for serving alcoholic beverages to a driver who subsequently caused the collision. The court concluded: "the consequences of serving liquor to an intoxicated person who the server knows or could have known is driving a car, is 'reasonably foreseeable' and the server could be held liable for the injuries inflicted by the intoxicated person as a result of his intoxication."

Ashlock v. Norris, 475 N.E. 2d 1167 (Ind. App. 1985), extended civil liability to an individual who merely furnished liquor to an adult who in a state of intoxication injured another. The court held that the legislature intended to extend civil liability to family, friends, or acquaintances who furnish "one more drink" to an intoxicated person. The case law recognizes no distinction between the duty imposed on a seller and a gratuitous provider, if the intoxicated person to whom they provided alcoholic beverages subsequently injures another.

Two related Indiana cases involving alcohol and universities are Bearman v. Notre Dame, 453 N.E. 2d 1196 (Ind. App. 1983), and Campbell v. Wabash College, 459 N.E. 2d 227 (Ind. App. 1986). Neither case involved the direct service of alcoholic beverages by the institution to the inebriated person who caused the injury to the suing party. Rather, the question concerned whether the institution's general knowledge of alcoholic consumption on university premises was sufficient to establish a duty to take such precautions as would have prevented the injuries from occurring. In the Bearman case the court concluded that the operator of a place of public entertainment (the football stadium and its adjoining grounds) owes a duty to keep the premises safe for invitees, that the university was knowledgeable about the use of alcoholic beverages on its facilities, and that it was a question for a jury to decide whether or not the university had taken adequate precautions.

In the Campbell case the court stated that since the college is not expected to assume a role anything akin to in loco parentis or a general insurer, the fact that the college allegedly knew that some of its students would, on occasion, drink and drive, and that unbeknownst to the university a particular fraternity member did consume alcoholic beverages in the privacy of his off-campus, fraternity house room (albeit, the house was owned by the college and leased to the fraternity) and did cause an injury, the college would not be held liable for injuries caused by that intoxicated student. It is arguable that if the school had knowledge of the drinking in question or if the nexis between the college and premises were closer, it could have been found liable for the ensuing injury.

C. Areas of Potential University Liability

In a white paper on student alcohol abuse prepared by the Washington law firm of Covington and Burling for the American Council on Education, four functions common to college and universities that could be the source of potential liability for alcohol related injuries were considered: a) the university's limited role as a supervisor of student conduct; b) the university as a property owner; c) the university as a seller of alcohol; and d) the university as a social host.

1. The University as Supervisor

As was noted in the Campbell v. Wabash College case the student/university relationship, without more, does not make the school liable for the conduct of its students. It is not a "special relationship" of the sort that obliges a person to prevent another from injuring himself or others. Nevertheless, the law is not entirely consistent in defining the scope of the legal duty of colleges and universities to supervise student conduct. Influential leading cases from other states reject the view that schools have some duty arising from the doctrine of in loco parentis, to police the private behavior of college students. On the other hand, judges and juries still seem to be deciding occasional cases from the point of view that the "immaturity" of college age students makes their risky conduct sufficiently "foreseeable" that schools have some "duty" to protect against it. This inconsistency in legal decisions reflects society's own ambivalent feelings about whether college students are fully responsible adults or high spirited adolescents. Considering the statutes in Indiana and their construction by the courts, it is probable that, in the context of injuries resulting from student drinking at "public" functions, the university would be held liable. If a student consumes or uses alcohol in violation of the law with the knowledge, acquiesence and even support of university staff, the university or its agents also would probably be held liable for the foreseeable injuries resulting from their negligence.

2. The University as Property Owner

The university is also subject, as a property owner, to the legal duty to maintain safe premises. Generally speaking, a property owner owes a duty of reasonable care to those who come on their premises to live, transact business, work, attend athletic events, participate in spectator events, or engage in other legitimate activities. While the university is not an insurer of the safety of those who come on the campus and it cannot be held responsible simply because a student or another injures himself on school property, it may be held liable if it fails to remedy a foreseeably dangerous state of affairs of which it is or should be aware. Similarly, a school may be negligent if it fails to provide adequate security and protection to others from a person known to be abusive. This is especially the case where experience teaches that there could be a potential behavior problem in particular circumstances such as recurring rowdiness at football games or parties. This, of course, is the leaning of Bearman v. Notre Dame where it was stated in effect that if the university knew, or should have known, of the likelihood of potential disturbances or irresponsible conduct resulting from the use of alcohol, it should have taken such reasonable efforts as appropriate to prevent recurrences and to provide additional security or other monitoring methods appropriate to the situation.

3. The University as a Seller of Alcohol

Any one who sells alcohol commercially bears a special risk and responsibility generally established by statute. The Indiana laws and regulations governing the sale of alcoholic beverages which require licenses, fees, etc. pertain to the university's commercial sale of alcoholic beverages (i.e., in the Senior Bar, the Morris Inn, and the University Club). The Indiana dramshop statutes make it unlawful to sell alcohol to a minor or already intoxicated individual. Indiana cases like Elder and Elsperman have applied this statute to impose liability on licensed sellers of alcoholic beverages where the illegal purchaser injures a third party.

4. The University as a Social Host

One of the more controversial aspects of the recent trend toward discouraging alcohol abuse is the extension of dramshop liability to non-commercial or "social" hosts who serve alcoholic beverage to minors or intoxicated persons. What constitutes behavior as a "social" host may be a critical question in particular circumstances. Obviously, where the university or its agents serve alcoholic beverages as part of official receptions or ceremonies (e.g. alumni reunions, etc.) the university is a social host. At hall parties or SYRs where rectors or resident assistants serve as facilitators, moderators or observers, these rectors and assistants would probably be regarded as agents of the university for the purpose of social host liability. Similarly, the university may be regarded as a social host if alcoholic beverages are served during seminars at a faculty member's home, at departmental receptions or cocktail parties, or at athletic award banquets. It seems clear that Indiana statutes as applied in Indiana cases, particularly Brattain v. Herron, would extend dramshop liability not only to those who are licensed to sell alcoholic beverages but also to those who give, provide or furnish alcoholic beverages to intoxicated individuals and minors. As the court said, "we see no distinction between one who sells alcoholic beverages to a minor and one who gives alcoholic beverages to a minor. The legislature has provided that either of these actions is a violation of the statute."

D. Additional Statutes of Potential Relevance

1. Prohibition Against Public Intoxication. While it is clear that the statute is not intended to govern public intoxication on private property (i.e., either in one's home or on the premises of the university), it can be argued that if public intoxication is prohibited by the civil state, "public" intoxica-

tion on the campus of Notre Dame is likewise an offense to the civil society which constitutes our community. This was certainly the conclusion drawn by the Beauchamp Committee in 1984 when it stated: "It is the conviction of the university that drunkenness and public intoxication are unacceptable . . . sanctions should be imposed on those students found intoxicated."

2. Indiana statutes make it a criminal offense for a minor to possess, consume, or transport alcoholic beverages. It is clear from testimony presented to this task force that this statute is regularly violated by students, all too frequently with the knowledge and acquiescence of university employees. A logical question seems to be: are there any principles by which Notre Dame can permit, condone, or acquiesce in the open violation of this statute?

E. Summary Observations

As this analysis indicates, the university runs the risk of potential legal liability because of excessive drinking on the campus, particularly when the drinking is done in violation of the criminal law. While it may be impossible to totally eliminate potential liability on the Notre Dame campus, if the university can show that it was unaware of the violations that occurred, it would be well positioned to defend itself against liability claims. Obviously, known violations of the law, with limited or no enforcement, currently place the university at serious risk. Many students, faculty, and staff are not aware of this risk, and the university, as it did five years ago, should reconsider the extent to which it is willing to assume such potential liability.

Existing policies of the university, as stated on pages 14 and 15 of the current version of Du Lac, do in fact comply with Indiana statutes. However, implementation of these policies not only fails to establish uniform procedures to insure basic compliance with these laws, but in some instances actually contravenes them.

Where service of alcohol is allowed, it is doubtful that there is any legitimate rationale under which the University may allow such service contrary to the laws of the state of Indiana. It is doubtful that the Indiana alcoholic beverage laws are illegal, immoral, or in violation of first principles, any one of which might allow one to disregard them through appeal to higher authority and civil disobedience. The University may, if it wishes, attempt to change the law or have it modified in a way which would exempt it from its application, but so long as the law is in force, the University, like all citizens in the state of Indiana, bears the responsibility for compliance.

III. Alcohol Policies of American Colleges and Universities: A Selective Comparison

Alcohol policies were solicited from five groups of colleges and universities: schools in the state of Indiana (subject to the same laws as Notre Dame); schools identified as "Catholic;" schools identified with the Congregation of Holy Cross; "peer" institutions; and a smattering of Ivy League schools. It was believed that a sample from these categories would give a representative cross-section of institutional approaches on how the use of alcohol issue is handled on college campuses.

While the specifics of individual policies are as varied as the institutions themselves, the assumption was that there would be basically three different approaches evident: policies that leave the issue of alcohol totally in the hands of the individuals (which means its use is in no way proscribed by the institution); policies that restrict the use of alcohol in some way; and policies that totally prohibit the possession and use of alcohol. Not surprisingly, the greatest number of institutions surveyed articulate policies that fall into the second category. No school takes a position of complete laissez-faire. No school permits the distribution of alcohol to minors if the alcohol has been purchased with university funds.

This point bears special attention. Evidence presented to the Task Force clearly indicates that at Notre Dame the purchase of alcohol for All-Hall Semi-Formal parties (or SYRs) is accomplished with a documented trail of administrative (institutional) approval, and the money used to purchase the alcohol comes from all-hall party funds, and the alcohol purchased will be knowingly served to minors, Notre Dame would appear to be in a most singular position.

Alcohol policies almost always reference the applicable state laws. Where mention of the law is absent, the policies of those institutions totally prohibit all possession and use of alcohol. The most liberal attitude towards the law was expressed in the policy of Dartmouth, which bears reiteration: "Students are accountable for their own decisions regarding alcohol use; they are also responsible for understanding applicable laws. The College will not be responsible for enforcing State and local laws nor will it shield students from the legal consequences of their actions should they choose to violate State law." While the private consumption of alcohol by individuals at Dartmouth is left as a matter of individual choice, the institutional position on public consumption is different: "College-affiliated organizations or sponsors of College-registered events may provide alcohol only to persons of legal drinking age and otherwise in accordance with applicable laws."

Use of alcohol on college/university property among all those surveyed is rather uniformly either prohibited or restricted to authorized events or designated areas (most commonly the university tavern). Authorized events appear to be those reasonably capable of complying with state laws regarding the distribution and consumption of alcohol. Such events might be dances where there are bars staffed by licensed bartenders, and/or where any number of procedures for checking the age of consumers.

Use of alcohol in residence halls owned by the institutions falls into the three basic categories. Half of the institutions specifying a position on alcohol in residence halls limit its possession and use to those of legal drinking age in the privacy of their individual rooms. Approximately one quarter of the survey bans all possession and use of alcohol in undergraduate residence halls. The remaining 25% do not articulate any restrictions on the possession and use of alcohol in the dormitories. It could be inferred that the lack of specified restrictions implies permission for, or the absence of sanctions against, all individual (regardless of age) use of alcohol. Whether or not this is true is unknown on the basis of information received.

The test of the effectiveness of these policies is undoubtedly in their enforcement. Information in this category is sketchy, at best. One policy candidly admits that its prohibitions are not enforceable on an institutional level and "entrusts" the students to comply with state laws. Most indicate that violations of the policies will incur some sort of disciplinary action. A number indicate that these penalties range from fines, community service work, educational/counseling programs, to suspension &/or expulsion from the institution. While most limit their attention to the action of individuals on their property, some extend their concern for alcohol consumption to activity that takes place off-campus as well. For instance, Stonehill College (another CSC institution) states that its students are responsible for their behavior whether the alcohol was consumed on or off campus.

Alcohol related behavior off-campus is addressed by a variety of institutions. The University of Portland (CSC), Boston College (Catholic) and Texas Christian University (private, non-Catholic) state that violations of state drinking laws will be considered violations of institutional policies and will subject students to disciplinary action. St. John's University and St. Benedict College in Minnesota share a policy which states: "Abusers of alcohol at an off-campus event in which students are representing or are seen as representing the University/College, are subject to disciplinary action including probation, fine and eviction." This policy also cites the server of alcohol to minors as subject to the same penalties as the drinker, building on the legal principle discussed in the previous section of this report (II. Legal Issues).

Relatively little attention is paid to the physical state of drunkenness in the policies surveyed which restrict rather than prohibit alcohol use. Violations of policies are illegal drinking by minors (the act rather than the quantity) or consequent destructive/abusive behavior. There is considerable concern evidenced for the legal liabilities associated with drunken behavior (for instance, driving under the influence), but drunkenness per se is of relatively minor concern to most of the institutions surveyed, at least insofar as their alcohol policies are concerned.

In conclusion, Notre Dame's current policy regarding the use of alcohol by its students and on its campus is, at face value, similar to those of the majority of the institutions surveyed. How it differs from other policies appears to be more in what it fails to say, rather than in what it does say. It fails to extend its compliance with the law to the guidelines for all-hall student parties and it fails to extend to groups other than students its concern for alcohol use at "tailgaters and other gatherings on university grounds."

IV. Empirical Findings And Student Initiatives: 1988 Study

As part of the Alcohol Task Force activities, a major survey of student attitudes and behavior toward the issue of alcohol was developed. Each of the task force members was asked to submit questions in writing pertaining to concerns that they wanted to see addressed. These questions were organized into a two-page survey before Christmas and were tested on a small sample of students. Based on these inputs and suggestions from task force members, a final survey instrument was devised during the semester break.

The questionnaire was sent via campus mail to 200 randomly selected students from each class year. A cover letter signed by the student members of the task force accompanied the questionnaire. It was distributed in the last week of January, 1988. A mail survey was deemed the appropriate vehicle, because students could fill out the survey in private and at their leisure. Also, it was felt that more honest answers would result since the returns were anonymous. Seven questionnaires were returned as undeliverable. At the cut off date of February 15, 354 completed surveys were returned. This is a respectable rate of 44.7%. After the cutoff date, an additional 58 surveys were returned (for a total rate of 52%) that are not included in this analysis, but will be tabulated at a later date and subimitted in a separate student survey report with the answers to the open questions at the end of the questionnaire.

The responding students were representative of the entire undergraduate student body with one exception. There were only 2 percent off-campus students who responded. This does not appear to be a major problem, because most of the issues concern on-campus students. The class distribution of the sample was as follows: 26.3% Freshmen; 29.4% Sophomores; 22.3% Juniors; and 22% Seniors. The males accounted for 61 percent of the sample and the females 39 percent. The mean overall age was 19.7 years.

The total results with appropriate percentages and means are shown Tables in the Appendix to this report. Only a summary of the results are provided here.

According to the respondents, alcohol is perceived to be an important part of the social life at Notre Dame. Over 90 percent of all students indicated that they do drink alcohol (see Table 2 in Appendix). The low is 87 percent for the freshmen and increases to 99 percent for the seniors. The most mentioned frequency of consumption is two to three times a week with 43 percent of the students responding in this category. Males were more likely than females to drink this often. When asked whether this amount was more frequent and in larger amounts than a year ago, 59 percent of the freshmen answered yes and 57 percent stated higher, respectively. Therefore, freshmen are consuming more alcohol and more often than they did in high school.

Another question asked the location where students consume alcohol (see Table 3). Approximately 50 percent drink on campus and 50 percent off campus. On-campus parties, an individual's dorm room/apartment, and off-campus parties were the most mentioned places, but there was a good dispersion over the other categories as well. One interesting finding is that over 20 percent of the drinking done by freshmen occurs at off-campus parties. The Senior/Alumni club is heavily patronized by the seniors, with this location receiving the highest allocation among seniors' responses. The club appears to be serving its purpose as a place where students 21 and over can drink.

Overall student understanding of the current alcohol policy is good. Students generally know what activities are prohibited or are allowable under the current policy (see Table 4). Seventy percent of the students answered that the policy was enforced consistently in their dorm. The students are divided in their view as to whether the policy interferes with the social life on campus. More males and upperclassmen think that it does. A large percentage (78%) believe that the current policy has led to more students going to off-campus parties.

Students know the physical effects of alcohol. At least 70 percent gave the correct answer to the four questions about the physical effects of alcohol (see Table 6). The only meaningful difference was that students 21 and over realized with greater frequency than those under 21 that people cannot recognize physical impairment that occurs with drinking.

A number of questions were devoted to the issue of drunkenness. The students responded with ambivalence (3.14) on a scale of 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree to the statement: There is nothing wrong with being drunk in your hall (Table 7). Females expressed more disagreement to this statement than males. Student drunkenness has not generally interfered with students' ability to study, watch TV or sleep in their rooms (see Table 8). The only inconvenience is about 10 percent of students are disturbed in their sleeping once a week by student drunkenness. Students are much more comfortable (50%) than uncomfortable with students who are drunk (22%). This percentage is even stronger for friends (see Table 9). Students do not believe that drunkenness goes unattended by hall staff (67% said no), but are divided in whether it goes unattended by other students (44% said no and 43% said yes) (see Table 10). Almost all students (86%) believe that a student who is drinking too much should be approached about his/her drinking habits.

Several options were proposed for students in relation to curbing alcohol abuse on campus. There was only modest support (16% said yes) for the idea of a dorm where alcohol was not served at social functions and only half of them (8%) would like to live in such a dorm. There was even less support (4.5%) for a dry dorm (see Table 12). Students have mixed feelings on whether or not there should be more severe punishment for the chronic alcohol abuser (51 percent said no). Many students wrote addedums to their responses indicating a belief that the person should receive counseling and not punishment. There is some support for a three-credit elective on the issue of alcohol. 28.5 percent of all students said they would enroll in such a course, with upperclassmen more likely to respond positively to this question (see Table 14). The final question asked if there should be a place on campus where underage students could experience responsible drinking. Not surprisingly, the vast majority (76%) of students said yes, and 73 percent said they would go to such a place (see Table 15). There was not much support for the idea of having faculty or administrators attend SYRs to forestall excessive drinking (see Table 16).

Several lines at the end of the questionnaire were provided for students to write in comments about alcohol. A large number (over 100) did make comments. These will be summarized by sex and class year and will be provided at a later date and combined with the results of the late respondents in a separate report.

V. Prevention, Education, and Intervention

A. Prevention

The most common approach of American society at large, and of universities in particular, in preventing alcohol abuse and related problems has been through control of the substance. Abolition, prohibition, age restrictions, government controlled sales, taxation and laws limiting the hours of consumption are examples of such attempts, each of which has its own strengths and weaknesses.

While abolition produces at least a short term and obvious reduction in consumption, negative developments associated with it (e.g., bootlegging, crime) have made it unsuccessful at a national level. But many cities and towns have voted to be dry and do report reductions in alcohol-related problems. Some colleges and universities are similarly dry. It should be noted that these governmental and educational institutions are, on occasion, accused of merely dumping problems they would otherwise have on their surrounding communities. Their problems are lessened; the problems of their neighbors are increased.

Increasing the cost of alcohol through taxation is associated with a decrease both in consumption and in alcohol-related problems, according to the Alcohol and Health, Sixth Congressional Report. Conversely, lowering the legal age for consumption is associated with increased vehicle-related accidents and deaths in the eighteen to twenty-one-year-old group (with the assumption being that the reverse is also true (Schmidt and Kornaczewski, 1975; Douglass and Freedman, 1977). Overall, the Alcohol and Health, Sixth Congressional Report shows that attempts to control the substance through legislation (increasing taxation to increase cost; limiting sales and consumption to persons over 21; reducing availability in public places; etc.) have resulted in a reduction in alcohol abuse and other related problems.

B. Education

A second major attempt at prevention of alcohol-related problems has been through education. One approach has focused on prevention education related to alcoholism. This includes general community education about alcoholism (primary), early detection of problem drinkers (secondary), and maintenance of sobriety (tertiary).

Other educational approaches have addressed broader issues related to alcohol use and abuse. Informational programs have been widely used which attempt to dispel erroneous ideas about alcohol and its effects, explain behavior changes associated with use/abuse, and spell out the legal ramifications of use/abuse.

Another approach focuses on clarifying the values associated with an individual's alcohol choices. Individuals are encouraged to evaluate the role of alcohol in their lives and to make conscious positive decisions concerning their personal use.

Studies have shown that if there is a relationship between knowledge of the effects of alcohol and one's attitude or behavior, that relationship is almost indiscernible (Oblander, 1984). Some prevention programs attempt to impose on potential drinkers a fear of negative consequences. But fear is seen to have a limited value in terms of behavior change. Only short-term effects are significant. In fact, some studies have suggested that for at least one sub-group of college drinkers (those described as being "risk takers"), advertisements that portray extensive alcohol use as dangerous may, in fact, be encouraging the very behavior they intend to discourage (Lastovicka et al., 1987).

Approaches which employ techniques of values clarification have met with some success. Likewise, the use of peers in disseminating information dramatically improves the success rate of educational efforts (Kandel, 1980; Berkowitz and Perkins, 1987). Educational programs which include information personally relevant to their participants also tend to be effective. For instance, knowledge of the legal definition of intoxication is less important than knowing the mood or feelings of a person abusing alcohol.

In America, alcohol consumption and related deaths and injuries peaked in 1981 and have steadily declined since that time. Those who support control of the substance conclude that legislation accounts for these reductions, while those who support preventive education cite the extensive use of advertising and other informational efforts as the reason for improvement. While the relative contribution of each is difficult to measure, empirical findings suggest it would be wise to include both education and control should be in a prevention program.

C. Intervention

Prior to 1973, it was assumed in the field of alcoholism treatment that severe alcohol problems, especially those related to the disease alcoholism, could only be solved when the person with the disease or problem had hit his or her "bottom." A person had to want to get well, it was consistently asserted, before he or she could get well.

In 1973, Vernon E. Johnson, founder of the Minneapolis based Johnson Institute, published the best selling I'll Quit Tomorrow in which he outlined an alternative intervention process. Johnson and his associates believed that intervention need not be keyed to the point when the person with the alcohol-related problem has had enough, but rather when his or her family, friends or employers have had enough of his or her alcohol-related behavior. According to this scenario, the individual is presented with evidence of his or her deteriorating performance and relationships in such a way that he or she will agree (however begrudgingly) to seek help for changing the causes of those difficulties.

As Johnson's method gained acceptance, it was employed in much broader applications. Other researchers found that groups or communities also could confront individuals with standards of acceptable behavior. Failure to conform to the accepted standards meant separation from the community. In this model confrontation is not a matter for a professional therapist, but an effort by a concerned community to ensure its well-being and the well-being of its individual members.

D. Summary

While professional therapists, researchers, and concerned individuals can debate the strengths and weaknesses of all the programs discussed above (prevention through controlled availability, educational programming, and intervention), a common element of concern is shared by all. Their aim is health, both of individuals and of community. Alcohol can enhance or destroy; it is a matter of choice and responsibility. Any program or method which helps individuals make wise choices merits attention and support. At this juncture, Notre Dame's efforts should be inclusive rather than exclusive. Programs of control, complemented by those that educate and those that enforce community standards all can assist this community in coming to a point of maturity and health in how we choose to use alcohol.

SECTION THREE
Programmatic and Policy Recommendations

I. Goals:

A. To reduce the emphasis on alcohol in the life of the University community;

B. To affirm that the primary role in making decisions about drinking is the individual's and it is the University's responsibility to provide an environment which encourages responsible behavior;

C. To assist the University community in the establishment and implementation of norms and sanctions regarding alcohol use and abuse;

D. To assist individuals in making educated, responsible decisions with regard to the role alcohol will or will not play in their lives.

II. Assumptions

A. The policies of the University of Notre Dame should be consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana. The University should not be in the position of serving alcohol to minors.

B. In the matters of individual choice concerning the use of alcohol, no member of the Notre Dame community should feel pressure to drink.

C. Moderation should be the standard of those individuals who choose to drink alcoholic beverages. Drunkenness, in and of itself, is unacceptable and not simply because of its consequences.

D. Educational programming, controlled availability, and the process of intervention should all be included in the University's response to the use and abuse of alcohol.

E. The principles enunciated by the University Committee on the Responsible Use of Alcohol (1984) are endorsed by this Task Force except in those areas where specific reservations are expressed or recommendations for specific change are presented.

III. Recommendations

The Task Force recommends a comprehensive approach to deal with the use and abuse of alcohol within our community. While modifications are anticipated in all of the areas which we will address, it is our conviction that for this program to be effective education, controlled availability, desirable alternatives to drinking, and consistent intervention should be included. In order to ensure consistency and continuity, the Task Force recommends the establishment of an review committee, made up of all segments of the University which would monitor the implementation of the alcohol programs and policies resulting from our recommendations.

A. Progam Recommendations

1. Educational Programming: The Task Force recommends that the University's alcohol educational program follow the guidelines of the American Health Association which suggests primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention efforts directed towards students, faculty, and staff. The responsibility for carrying out this recommendation should reside with either the Office of Alcohol and Drug Education or a committee designated by the administration which would work in cooperation with the Office of Alcohol and Drug Education.

a. Primary prevention should include:

1) Required credit course for freshmen in alcohol education. This course should be interdisciplinary and address the topic from at least physiological, psychological, sociological, and historical perspectives. This should be developed in conjunction with the Office of Alcohol and Drug Education

2) Departmental and inter-departmental lectures, courses, symposia which are open to all members of commmunity.

3) The Office of Alcohol and Drug Education should sponsor alcohol awareness events which might feature, for example, a celebrity who appeals to a broad segment of the University community. In addition to discussing some alcohol-related issues, the individual ought to appeal to an audience interested in music, theatre, government, business, etc.

4) Information should be regularly disseminated through posters, brochures, newspaper ads, radio and TV spots.

5) All University publications should reject advertising that glamorizes alcohol and/or an alcoholic life style.

b. Secondary prevention should include:

1) Training of all University supervisory personnel (including hall staff) in intervention processes.

2) Establishment of a University-wide program of peer counseling in which individuals are trained in ways to lead others into making responsible alcohol decisions, to detect problems early, and to intervene effectively.

3) The Task Force has been apprised of student initiated efforts. University offices (such as the Office of Drug and Alcohol Education, Center for Social Concerns, and Student Activities) should encourage and expand the student organized activities. Existing programs include:

a) The student-run BACCHUS group which attempts to promote responsible attitudes about drinking with on-campus education and a local school outreach program.

b) The Notre Dame Designated Driver program aimed at promoting responsible action regarding drinking and driving. The project is designed to be used by all University members and the South Bend community.

c) The Student Intervention team provides campus-wide training for individuals who want to learn to help impaired students. The team provides information and peer support.

d) The Buzz Bus, started by the Hall Presidents' Council, provides safe transportation back to campus to those students who choose not to drive home from off-campus parties and bars.

e) A newly-initiated community outreach program which connects recovering students with adolescent substance abusers in the South Bend/Mishawaka treatment program.

f) The Non-Alcoholic Event Fund, set up by the Office of Alcohol and Drug Education, to provide funds for creative social alternatives to the use of alcohol.

4) Establish a campus-wide assistance policy on alcohol use, abuse, and treatment which pertains to all members of the community including faculty. Current EAP (Employee Assistance Programs) services should be expanded to include faculty.

c. Tertiary prevention should include:

1) Continued support for groups such as AA (Alcoholics Anonymous), ACOA (Adult Children of Alcoholics), and ADAPT (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Training)

2) Expanded offerings for those who need assistance in responsible decision making with regard to alcohol use. Such offerings would address such issues as values clarification, stress management, and decision making skills.

2. Wellness

The Task Force recommends that the University of Notre Dame begin a comprehensive program, coordinated by a central office, of health promotion. Commonly refered to as Wellness Programming, this endeavor would address the spiritual, vocational, physical, intellectual, social and emotional needs of all members of the community. The Task Force is aware of a number of current programs which already address one or more aspects of health promotion: Non-Varsity Athletics, University Health Service, the University Counseling Center, Campus Ministry and the Department of Human Resources. Some of these units have also attempted to collaborate on programs. The Task Force is likewise aware of programs within the University Food Services, health suggestions in the Staff Newsletter, and a variety of similar activities. However, if the philosophy of health promotion is to have a significant impact on the campus as a whole, it will be necessary for these efforts to be coordinated through a single office.

B. Policy Recommendations

1. Providing alcohol

a. In all circumstances where the University serves as the host, alcohol shall be provided only when it is possible to ensure moderation of consumption through such reasonable measures as:

1) Licensed bartenders dispensing;

2) Consumers are of majority age;

3) At events where admission is charged, the cost of the alcoholic drinks shall be borne by individual consusmers and shall not be included in the admission fee.

4) That the bar is open for a limited time (brief) and either before or after a meal.

5) That those who are hosting provide alternatives to alcohol.

6) The provision of table wine or champagne is seen as within the guidelines of controlled availability and moderation, but an equally festive non-alcoholic alternative should be provided.

2. Residence Halls

The Task Force recommends that the policy and recommendations on Residence Halls be amended as follows:

a. Students are responsible for compliance with Indiana Criminal Law regarding alcohol consumption. The University will endorse no activity which allows for or condones non-compliance with such laws. The University reserves the right to enter private areas of the hall to require compliance with Indiana laws and to impose sanctions if drinking in such areas is brought to the attention of the hall staff through disruption of hall life. In any case of drunkenness, whether or not drunkenness is disruptive of the common good, the hall staff may intervene.

b. Each hall may have all-hall semi-formal parties each semester. In order for the hall to have such a party on a particular occasion, at least 70% of the hall residents must agree to such a party's being held.

c. The hall will provide food and beverages for such parties. The hall will not provide alcoholic beverages.

3. Drunkenness - The Task Force recommends:

a. That the publications and policies of the University of Notre Dame clearly state that drunkenness, both public and private, will not be accepted on this campus (for example: potential incoming students be informed prior to their decision to attend Notre Dame.)

b. That the University promulgate guidelines responding to drunkenness of students, faculty, staff, alumni, and campus visitors;

c. That these guidelines stress the responsibility of the institution and of the individual under Indiana State Law;

d. That these guidelines include specific graduated educational, intervention and disciplinary steps;

e. That these guidelines include a firm response (such as a mandated medical leave, separation from the community, etc.) for individuals who are unable to successfully follow the recommended steps.

4. The Task Force endorses opportunities for alternative choices to the use of alcohol and interactions with those who choose its use. We recommend the development of "dry" sections or floors in some residence halls. We would also encourage, by analogy, areas in which smoking is prohibited. Residents would choose these sections and would themselves be responsible for the enforcement of the local restrictions. Those who violate the policy would be expected to move to another area within the hall.

5. Football weekends

The Task Force recognizes, as did the Beauchamp committee, the many alcohol related problems associated with football weekends. We learned from a number of sources of the difficulty in control of alcohol use and enforcement at these times. Nevertheless, we make the following recommendations:

a. All official functions be subject to the general rules promulgated elsewhere in this report i.e. limited "open bars," cost of alcohol borne by participants only (cash or ticket), and the provision of alternatives to alcohol provided, etc.

b. Public drunkenness will not be tolerated. Enforcement rules to be drafted and promulgated by appropriate University security personnel may include exclusion from University grounds, initiating criminal charges, etc. and in the case of students and staff, such disciplinary action as may be subsequently adopted.

c. Training of sufficient security personnel to enforce the rules adopted and promulgated shall be initiated and continually reviewed by those responsible for these areas.

d. Since alcohol consumption and public drunkenness increase substantially when home football games are scheduled in the evening and the combination of greater alcohol consumption, automobile operation and darkness increase danger to all University guests, the scheduling of evening football games shall be prohibited.

e. The rule prohibiting the consumption of alcohol in the inner part of the campus should be strictly enforced.

f. As in the past, a letter will be sent annually to all alumni and season ticket holders who may attend football games informing them of Notre Dame policies. The current letter should be amended to forcefully address the issue of drunkenness on University grounds. These materials should state that these rules will be enforced.

g. The scheduling of AA meetings the morning of each home football game is commended and should be continued.

6. Alumni weekends

The Task Force examined information from those responsible for alumni weekends along with information from other members of the committee who work with this event. It is clear that significent positive steps have been taken. It is also clear to the Task Force that problems remain with this event.

The consumption of alcoholic beverages at alumni weekends shall be governed by all generally applicable statements made elsewhere in this report. In addition, the following recommendations are made.

a. Public drunkenness shall not be tolerated on University grounds. Rules shall be formulated and promulgated by appropriate University officials which may include expelling violators from University grounds, initiating criminal charges, or in the case of University students or staff such disciplinary action as is subsequently adopted.

b. Limitations on the number and open hours of refreshment tents serving alcoholic beverages shall be continued. If alcohol is to be served, all cash bars for wine and mixed drinks should be extended to include a cash bar for beer as well.

c. If cocktail hours prior to alumni events cannot be eliminated, or changed to cash bar events, their time should continue to be limited.

d. The scheduling of AA meetings and Al-Anon meetings during reunions is commended, should be continued and should be complemented with other sessions which deal with concerns related to the family and alcohol.

7. Social Alternatives

We have learned, from a number of sources, that social space and social alternatives remain limited. Some improvements have been made in response to recommendations made four years ago. However, for many students, the residence halls remain the focal point of social life. The physical limitations of most residence halls are such that few social activities are really possible. We have also learned that sports are a positive outlet for many but that these facilities are often either overcrowded or unavailable. Theodore's has met the needs of some students. Given the continuing limitations in this area, the Task Force recommends that the University administration attempt to address this problem with some immediate changes and also develop long-term plans for major additions to the number and variety of social alternatives.

a. Immediate changes

1) Increase the availability of existing non-varsity sports and recreational facilities on campus. Hours can be extended and the Notre Dame community members should be given priority for reserving time. The availability of the JACC to student use should be increased and every effort should be made to keep the facility open to students at all times, especially during the winter. "Outside" shows and events should be limited or staged in such a way as not to deny students access to the entire building. Students should also be encouraged to use the newer athletic facilities (Rolfs pool, Eck tennis pavilion, and Loftus). We recommend that one or more of these facilities be open for late night use on an experimental basis (e.g., extending the pool hours to 2 a.m. one night of the weekend or promoting interhall tennis or track competition on weekends).

2) Add lighting for outside basketball courts where presently not available to allow students to have more outdoor recreational opportunities in the evening.

3) There should be greater opportunities for students to socialize on campus. For students studying or socializing late at night (after midnight), the hours of La Fortune and the Huddle and/or the pay cafeteria should be extended. Students would not have to go off campus to get food if these hours were increased. Another possibility is to extend the hours of the Senior/Alumni Club on weekend nights so that students would be less likely to go to off campus bars.

4) Alternate plans and uses for Stepan Center should be considered. One option in the winter would be to use Stepan as a sports facility (basketball, soccer, floor exercises). A second option would be to use it for entertainment that would appeal primarily to students (e.g., concerts not large enough for the JACC).

5) Encourage use of our park-like campus for concerts and other recreational activities (outdoor). Develop multiple outdoor cafe/coffee-house settings on campus (e.g., residential quads, Library Mall, etc.) where light refreshments, informal socializing, and non-intrusive, spontaneous and planned entertainment would be available during fair-weather months.

6) Expand transportation to neighboring social centers so that students can more easily take advantage of opportunities that exist in the local community.

b. Long term suggestions

1) The University should aggressively seek funding for the construction of a major performing arts center. Such a facility would allow students to be exposed to a greater variety and number of concerts, plays and other types of entertainment (e.g., first-run movies). This facility also would dramatically improve the artistic climate of both the Notre Dame/St. Mary's and South Bend communities.

2) Investigate the feasibility of developing for commercial use a portion of the area immediately surrounding the campus. Any development should have as its goal the creation of a complex which would present students with the greatest variety of social alternatives. Such a complex could include a variety of shops (clothing, records, sporting goods, etc.), restaurants, movie theaters, night clubs (e.g., Theodore's) and pubs (e.g., Bennigan's, Piano Bars).

3) Development of a social club which would focus on games (table), video machines, etc., and which would be another gathering place for

students. One option would be to expand the capacity of the existing Senior/Alumni Club.

4) The remodeling, over time, of all residence halls to make them more "homey." This would include manageable sections of each hall having open kitchen and living room areas.

IV. Minority Recommendations

A. All-Hall Parties

The Task Force discussed and debated at length the current policies which govern all-hall parties (SYRs) and their implementation. The Task Force as a whole has recommended that all University policies comply with state law, and specifically that current policies be changed to articulate a proscription against providing dorm residents (many being minors) with alcohol purchased with hall funds. There are additional policy statements and guidelines, however, which the signers of this recommendation wish to strongly endorse. One is already a general provision of our current policy which has not been extended to include implementation at the SYRs, and that is: "No alcoholic beverages may be carried in open containers in the corridors or in any other public area of the residence halls. . . " During SYRs in particular, the current guidelines read: "All liquids must be served in private rooms," and that there are to be no bars in the corridors. We recommend that all these policies be consistently and firmly enforced at all times, including SYRs.

We have heard many positive things about SYRs in their current form: they enhance hall spirit; they are an opportunity for people to learn "responsible" drinking; they are a unique feature of Notre Dame social life. It also has been pointed out that since 90% (current survey estimate) of our students drink anyway, limiting alcohol at SYRs will not substantially reduce their alcohol consumption.

We have heard warnings about the possible consequences of limiting alcohol at SYRs. It has been suggested that there would be "no social life in the halls;" that no one would come to an SYR if alcohol was not present and in the open; that we would be driving even more students off campus to drink; and that it would be impossible to truly enforce such a policy.

The signers of this recommendation believe that the general policy governing alcohol use in the residence halls should be consistently enforced at all times, including social events such as all-hall parties. To not do so would suggest that the policies of this University as well as the laws of the state of Indiana ought to be selectively enforced. The implications here are numerous, including a presumption that both internal policies and civil laws are arbitrary, based primarily on situations rather than principles. Likewise, compliance with both becomes a matter of personal convenience rather than community responsibility.

We believe that both the University's policies aimed at controlling alcohol in the residence halls in order to maintain a civil environment, and the laws of the state of Indiana drafted to curb abuses of alcohol in its use by minors are reasonable and wise. The studies which we examined support the maintenance of a 21-year-old drinking age. Furthermore, we do not believe that the all-hall parties are an appropriate forum in which to teach responsible drinking, if such a goal is indeed valid. We do not believe that parties in the dorms will vanish, nor do we believe that implementation of our alcohol policy should be held responsible for driving students off-campus. We anticipate changes in present social practices, both inside and outside the dorms, and would welcome a situation where alcohol is not a necessary precondition to every social activity. Lastly, we do not believe proscribing alcohol use in public must necessarily produce more drinking behind closed doors.

Father Thomas King, CSC
(Signed)

Wendy Clauson Schlereth
(Signed)

John A. Poirier
(Signed)

Dolores Frese
(Signed)

Roger F. Jacobs
(Signed)

Patrick W. Utz
(Signed)

B. Tailgaters

The Task Force discussed at length the issue of alcohol consumption in public, particularly on the occasions of football weekends. It was noted that the policy recommendations of the Beauchamp Report in 1984 included firm statements proscribing the use of alcohol in public on University property. However, this same report was willing to tolerate tailgaters on football weekends as an exception to the application of its rule. The justification given for this exception was not that the positive nature of the festivities warranted such an exception, but rather that enforcement was not feasible. The signers of this recommendation would like to go on record as advocating the elimination of this exception on those grounds.

We have heard and seen numerous examples of the drunkenness prevalent in the parking lots preceding home football games. We do not believe that the image of this University should be tarnished by visitors witnessing such behavior on University property. We do not believe our guests are well served by providing them with the opportunity to indulge in such behavior. Nor do we believe our neighbors are well served by allowing the consumption of alcohol by drivers of motor vehicles, who will within hours be back on the highways.

We have learned of numerous types of activity taking place in public that we cannot fathom would be tolerated in any other situation. And we have learned that arrests are becoming more numerous. But perhaps the most disturbing information we have heard regarding activities in our parking lots prior to football games came from our own director of security. He advised us that if a disturbance occurred on Green Field it would take the Indiana National Guard to control it. That statement, in one sense, reenforces the rationale of the Beauchamp Report in permitting alcohol at tailgaters: it is, in essence, an admission that the tailgaters are beyond our ability to control. This, we firmly believe, is intolerable.

If the only practicable way to control the excessive use of alcohol on football weekends is to prohibit its use in public, including all the parking lots of the University, then we urge the University administration to do so. Advise all ticket holders that open containers of alcohol will be confiscated, and those who are inebriated will be remanded to the civil authorities. If our experts in security believe they can remedy the situation through other means, certainly those measures should be explored. Unfortunately, to date, the measures employed have not been adequately successful.

We have no wish to destroy the festive nature of our football weekends; we do have a strong desire to bring behavior at these times into conformance with our publicly professed standards. Just as it is important for our students to recognize that their social life ought not be dependent upon alcohol, so too must our guests.

Wendy Clauson Schlereth
(Signed)

_Sr. Joris Binder, O.P.__
(Signed)

_Fr. Thomas King, CSC____
(Signed)

_Roger F. Jacobs_________
(Signed)

_Stephen P. Newton, CSC__
(Signed)

_John A. Poirier_________
(Signed)

_Dolores Frese___________
(Signed)

_Patrick W. Utz__________
(Signed)

THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHING IN A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

Presented to
Prof. Timothy O'Meara
Provost of the University of Notre Dame

March 1988

The Task Force on the Quality of Teaching in a Research University was chaired by Richard Foley, professor of theology. Other members included John Attanasio, associate professor of law; Maureen Boulton, assistant professor of modern and classical languages; Daniel Costello, professor of electrical engineering; Jeffrey Kantor, associate professor of chemical engineering; Rev. Robert Krieg, C.S.C., associate professor of theology; Naomi Meara, professor of psychology; Daniel Pasto, professor of chemistry; David Ricchiute, associate professor of accountancy; Randal Ruchti, professor of physics; Lee Tavis, C.R. Smith Professor of Business Administration; John Van Engen, associate professor of history and director of the Medieval Institute; the Academic Commissioner for 1987-88; Stephanie Alden, a senior arts and letters student; Susan Faccenda, a third-year law student; and David Kinkopf, an undergraduate student.

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON TEACHING

Introduction

Our mandate, most simply stated, was to think about ways in which teaching at Notre Dame might be improved. We were to look at undergraduate teaching as well as the teaching that is being done in the graduate and professional schools. We were to determine what is being done well and what is being done less well. Most importantly, we were to forward recommendations for improving teaching at Notre Dame.

We gathered a fair amount of statistical data concerning teaching at Notre Dame and at other institutions, and we studied some of the literature on effective teaching, but most of our time was spent in talking with an enormous number of people around the university. We talked with faculty and students; we talked with the chairperson of nearly every department; we talked with every dean and many other administrators. In addition, we sent questionnaires to every faculty member as well as to random groups of undergraduate, graduate and professional students. Throughout, our questions were essentially the same. What do you perceive to be the problems, and what do you perceive to be the solutions?

Out of all this, we were able to distill a number of recommendations. We have grouped them into three categories. First, we make a set of recommendations that focus upon questions of staffing. These aim to ensure not only that there are enough staff to do the teaching but also that the right kinds of staff are doing the teaching. A second set of recommendations describes other measures that might be taken at the university level to encourage good teaching. Among our recommendations is that a university center for the support of teaching be established at Notre Dame. The final set deals with matters that are best addressed at the departmental level, ones concerning the evaluation and the supervision of teaching, for example.

We make a case for each of these recommedations individually, but lying behind these specific recommendations are our general impressions about the current state of teaching at Notre Dame and about strategies for improving it. These impressions guided much of our thinking.

The most important of these impressions is that there is an immense amount of good will at Notre Dame about teaching and that this can be put to use. No one wants to be a bad teacher. The problem is that despite these good intentions, many professors are not as effective teachers as they could be. Some of this, no doubt, is due to a lack of motivation, but some is also due to the fact that the university, the colleges, and the departments have not done enough to encourage effective teaching. In many cases, there seems to have been a policy of benign neglect with respect to teaching: just leave the professors alone and they will make a good go of it. Administrators and faculty have been co-conspirators in this policy. It is a comforting policy for both, comforting for administrators since they are relieved of the responsibility of finding creative ways to support and encourage good teaching and comforting for the faculty since it reinforces a cherished myth, the myth that teaching is essentially a private matter between professors and their students and that as such it is not much of anyone's business how they do it. Both attitudes must change. Administrators need to be as agressive at promoting good teaching as they are at promoting good research, and faculty need to realize that it is every bit as appropriate for their colleagues and for the university as a whole to be concerned with the quality of their teaching as it is for them to be concerned with the quality of their research.

This is not to say that we found the quality of teaching to be declining at Notre Dame. To the contrary, we found that the Notre Dame faculty does a good job of teaching. Moreover, it has continued to do so while upgrading the quality of its research. Indeed, there is a connection between the two. The intellectual content of courses at Notre Dame has never been better. This is one of the ways in which the increased emphasis on research at the university has improved teaching. However, there is much to be done. Undergraduate and graduate education at Notre Dame must become even more rigorous, and the increasing research capacities of the university have created unprecedented opportunties to make it so. The recruitment of powerful researchers must not be allowed to become an end in itself. It must also be viewed as a way to improve what goes on in the classroom. Moreover, there are trends that if continued unchecked will seriously undermine the quality of teaching at Notre Dame, especially undergraduate teaching. The proliferation of graduate offerings over the last decade, although necessary for the upgrading of the graduate program, has sometimes contributed to shortages of qualified faculty to meet undergraduate needs. A more subtle but no less serious problem is that the research demands of the faculty leaves them less time for marking papers, meeting with students, and so forth. So, the emphasis on quality research at Notre Dame brings with it both opportunities and problems. Our recommendations are aimed at capitalizing upon these opportunities and addressing these problems.

We came away from our discussions with much greater appreciation for what constitutes good teaching and for the variety of ways in which one can be a good teacher. Effective teaching is ultimately a matter of how much and how well students learn. The good teacher is one who motivates the uninspired, challenges the gifted, directs the committed, and generally elicits bursts of intellectual vitality from students. However, there are a variety of pedagogical styles and techniques through which this can be accomplished. Professors who are entertaining lecturers can be outstanding teachers but so too can professors who are experts at leading discussions and professors who have thought long and hard about structuring the classroom or laboratory to generate a maximum of learning. Everyone agrees that good teaching can take many forms, so much so that the point is apt to seem trivial when stated in isolation. Even so, there is a danger of this diversity not being adequately recognized by the committees who make hiring, re-appointment, and promotion decisions. More ominously, in the pursuit of research excellence there is a danger of these committees not taking teaching seriously at all. Those involved in such decisions must keep in mind the truism that professors are teachers as well as researchers. It is obviously too much to expect that all those whom Notre Dame hires or promotes will be outstanding teachers, just as it is too much to expect that they all will be ground-breaking researchers. But it is not too much to expect that all those whom Notre Dame hires and promotes be conscientious about their teaching. This means that they must be willing to prepare their classes carefully. It means that they must be willing to keep up on the important developments in their areas and to make themselves available to students for discussion outside the classroom. Most importantly, it means that they must be willing to work hard at establishing a climate in the classroom, the lab, or the studio in which students are encouraged to learn.

Finally, although we are convinced that measures can and should be taken at the university level to improve the teaching environment, we are equally convinced that the main effort to improve teaching must be at the departmental level. The departments themselves are in the best position to oversee their teaching. They have the expertise to determine what they should be teaching and how they should be teaching it. University-wide initiatives have two purposes. First, they can encourage the departments to think carefully and innovatively about how best to accomplish their teaching missions. Second, they can provide them with the support that they need to do so.

SET #1: RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING STAFFING

1. The University needs to increase substantially the size of the faculty.

Over the past decade, there have been a number of factors that have come together to make current staffing inadequate. First, teaching loads have been reduced across much of the university in an attempt to bring them in line with peer institutions. While new positions have been added, these have not kept pace with reduced teaching loads.[1] Second, the university has devoted much of its resources to improving its research capabilities, adding chaired professors with accomplished records, institutes aimed at specialized research, and buildings designed for offices, laboratories, and libraries. Third, in an effort to build up their advanced programs, the graduate and professional schools have increased their course offerings.[2] Fourth, the university has added curricular requirements to guarantee a liberal undergraduate education — e.g., the requirement that every undergraduate take at least one course in the Fine Arts. These requirements have substantially increased enrollments in certain departments. Fifth, some departments have been asked to contribute additional faculty to university or college mandated courses, such as Freshman Writing and the College of Arts and Letters Core Course. Sixth, undergraduate and graduate enrollments have increased.[3] Seventh, shifts in student interests have caused great fluctuations in the choice of major, initially affecting the business and engineering colleges and now the College of Arts and Letters.

These factors have introduced strains that have begun to affect the quality of education at the university. The strains appear to be the greatest upon introductory and mid-level undergraduate courses. The other end of the spectrum is in better shape. Indeed, over the past decade there has been an increase of more than 40% in the number of courses with small enrollments, most of them advanced courses for graduate students.[4] The marked increase of such courses accounts for a slight decrease in the average class size at Notre Dame over the past ten years. However, this masks the fact that a greater percentage of the students enrolled in lower level courses are being taught in large sections.[5] A modest number of these large sections, if staffed with the best teachers and carefully supervised in use of assistants, need not detract from the quality of undergraduate education. The goal should not be to eliminate large sections altogether but rather to insure that undergraduates also have access to a range of relatively small classes taught by regular faculty.

---

[1] Variable credit courses, directed readings, and other such complicating factors make it difficult to calculate precise average teaching loads at Notre Dame. Nonetheless, the available evidence indicates that in the fall semester of 1977 the average load for a faculty member was 8.0 credit hours. By the fall of 1987 the average load had decreased to 6.5 credit hours. There were 669 regular faculty teaching in the fall of 1987 as compared to 573 in the fall of 1977. So, approximately 4345 credit hours were taught by regular faculty in 1987 as opposed to 4584 in 1977. In other words, despite an increase in the number of faculty, the total number of credit hours taught by regular faculty in the fall of 1987 was less than in the fall of 1977. (These figures and those cited in the other notes were supplied to us by Charles W. McCollester, Coordinator of Analytical Studies.)

[2] For example, there were 450 graduate courses offered at the university in the fall of 1974, while in the fall of 1984 there were 610 graduate courses offered.

[3] In the fall of 1978 there were 6846 undergraduates, 1238 graduate students, 480 law students and 167 MBA students enrolled. In the fall of 1987 these numbers had increased to 7551, 1314, 520, and 317.

[4] For instance, in the fall of 1984 there were 776 courses that had less than 10 students enrolled in them, as compared with 532 such courses in the fall of 1974.

It is especially important that such courses be available to freshmen, since intellectual habits, including habits of class participation, are often set during the freshman year. But over the last ten years, there has been an erosion in the number of courses offered by regular faculty to freshmen.[6] It is also important that there be mid-level major courses with moderate enrollments. But if anything, the numbers in these courses are even more discouraging than in introductory courses. In popular majors and in departments with increased requirements, courses meant for undergraduate majors, most of which should ideally average between 20-40, commonly average between 40 and 80, and sometimes worse. Major courses of this size tend to stifle intellectual interaction, limit the possibility of frequent writing assignments, and in general encourage passivity on the part of students. This is not compatible with the highest quality of undergraduate education. Our assessment is that this is not an isolated problem. It is one that affects many departments and that also affects the professional schools.

The remedy is an expensive one. The size of the faculty needs to be increased substantially. In some departments the need for additional faculty is both obvious and large, and it is likely to become even more pressing in the coming years. In other departments the need is neither so obvious nor so large, but it is there nonetheless. In still others there may be only an apparent need, the appearance being created by an excess of graduate courses, an excess of programs, or other inefficient use of resources. There should be a detailed study of where the needs are greatest. There is no easy way to determine this. It cannot be done simply by looking at enrollments and teaching loads. The kind of teaching that is being done in a department also needs to be taken into account, as does the department's use of graduate students and adjuncts. Our recommendation is a general one. It is that substantial numbers of additional faculty will need to be hired in a significant number of departments if Notre Dame is to achieve its aspirations of being an institution that combines truly outstanding research with truly outstanding teaching.

2. In general teaching obligations within departments should be equivalent, and generally teaching obligations across departments should be equivalent.

Teaching loads, with a few exceptions, have improved remarkably across the university in recent years. This is so despite the fact that little has been enunciated by way of a formal policy. Most deans and chairpersons believe that a flexible stance is best, allowing for the realities of a university in transition and for the strengths as well as needs of individual faculty members. Nevertheless, we found there to be implicit goals of a 1/1 load in the college of science (not counting associated laboratory sessions), a 2/1 load in the college of engineering (again not counting associated laboratory sessions), and a 2/2 load in the colleges of arts and letters, law, and business. These goals take into account the realities of the marketplace. Departments at Notre Dame cannot be expected to compete effectively for new faculty if their teaching loads are out of line with the departments of peer institutions. At the same time, Notre Dame should not be a slave to the marketplace. There are prestigious universities whose research faculty in certain disciplines commonly do little or no teaching. If the lower teaching loads at these universities occasionally disadavantage Notre Dame in its attempt to recruit new faculty, then so be it. In the long run, Notre Dame's identity as an institution that takes teaching seriously is more valuable.

---

[5] In the fall of 1974 there were 129 sections with enrollments between 51 and 100 and 35 sections with enrollments of greater than 100. In the fall of 1984 the number had risen to 156 sections with enrollments between 51 and 100 and 49 sections with enrollments of greater than 100, increases of 21% and 40% respectively.

[6] 57% of the freshman courses in the fall of 1974 were taught by regular faculty; in the fall of 1984 the percentage was 45.

It is important for all of our faculty to have reasonable teaching loads. It is particularly important that the junior faculty of a department not have a larger teaching load than is standard for senior faculty of that department. This is important for reasons of morale as well for reasons of fairness. Junior faculty are evaluated with respect to the quality of their teaching as well as for the quality of their research. They must have the opportunity to do both well. Otherwise, they will inevitably come to resent the considerable time and effort required for good teaching. Similarly, it is important, again for reasons of morale as well as for reasons of fairness, that all faculty at the university be judged by the same demanding standards of research and teaching. But if they are to be judged by the same standards, they must have similar opportunities, and this means that teaching obligations across departments must be roughly equivalent. We recognize that occasional departures from this goal may be necessary. We realize, for example, that departmental needs as well as an individual faculty member's talents may sometimes dictate differential teaching obligations within a department. We realize also that teaching and research take a variety of forms across departments and that there is an even greater variety across colleges. As a result, it is difficult to compare teaching duties. Similar duties may not translate into a similar number of formal courses. A large Ph.D program, for example, requires that faculty devote a large amount of time to reading and directing dissertations, grading qualifying examinations, and other like activities. Likewise, organizing and supervising laboratory or studio sessions can be time consuming for faculty, and yet these kinds of teaching duties are not always adequately reflected in official teaching loads. Such observations, important as they are, do not conflict with our recommendation, which is that obvious inequities in teaching obligations within and across departments fuel resentment and in general must be avoided.

Those of us who already have a fair teaching load should accept it as both a responsibility and an opportunity. With this load we should do our teaching well, do our research well, and engage in a reasonable amount of service to our departments and to our colleges. And it is not too much to expect that we do so without petitioning for further reduction of our teaching obligations. The opportunity is that with this fair load we should be able to upgrade continuously the quality of our courses. We should not rely on the same lecture notes semester after semester. Both the intellectual content of our courses and our presentation of this content should become better and better.

3. Chaired and Full Professors should be fully involved in undergraduate education.

Chaired professors and full professors set the tone for their departments. We found there to be a widespread perception that the appointment of chaired professors — valued for their publications, their grants, external contacts, and so on — has detracted from the university's teaching mission. In reality, despite increasing pressures in this direction from the profession at large, most chaired professors at Notre Dame teach the same or only slightly less than senior colleagues in their departments.

We nonetheless believe that both the perception and the reality could be improved by the adoption of a public policy. Namely, although negotiations with candidates for chaired professorships and other senior positions must be flexible, candidates should be made aware that at Notre Dame even chaired professors are expected to do their fair share of teaching at the undergraduate level. Making this policy public would accomplish at least three purposes. Negatively, it would help dispel the idea that chaired professors have little to do with the teaching mission of the university. Positively, it would make clear to chair candidates that Notre Dame is committed to undergraduate teaching. Best of all, it would ensure that undergraduate education at Notre Dame includes interaction with its best scholars. It is argued by some that undergraduate courses cannot be intellectually powerful and that as a result the best scholars are more effectively used in graduate courses. In fact, the argument should be reversed. Notre Dame's best scholars can be used to increase the intellectual power and rigor of undergraduate education. Notre Dame should be a place where undergraduates regularly are challenged by our best minds. For their parts, departments need to find creative ways to make it feasible for their most powerful researchers to be involved in their undergraduate programs.

There is another aspect of endowed professorships that has a worrying impact upon teaching at Notre Dame. Given the steep rise in competitive salaries at the chair level and the perquisites attached, a fair number of named chairs are effectively underendowed. As a result, the appointment of a chaired professor may cost a department a junior position. If the chaired professor is not as engaged in undergraduate education as would be the junior professor, the result will be fewer teaching resources for the department. The goal should be to secure adequate levels of funding for our endowed chairs, a step already initiated by a number of other universities.

4. The use of adjuncts to teach basic courses should be minimized, but when they are used they should be paid a respectable salary.

There are two kinds of adjunct faculty. First, there are professionals who teach a subject for which the university has no full-time specialist and probably never will. These adjuncts bring expertise to fields such as banking, law, journalism, psychology, and medicine. For them the level of remuneration is less of a critical issue. Moreover, if they are chosen carefully and used judiciously, they can greatly enrich undergraduate, graduate, and professional education at Notre Dame.

A second group of adjuncts is comprised of individuals who teach basic courses for which there is inadequate staff, sometimes owing to leaves of absence but more often to chronic staff shortages in meeting university-authorized requirements. These adjuncts tend to be otherwise unemployed Ph.D.'s who are often also faculty spouses. The amount of teaching done by such adjuncts at Notre Dame has not increased significantly over the last ten years, and only a few departments make frequent and extensive use of this kind of adjunct. Nevertheless, highly visible and sensitive problems surround their use. Two sorts of problems stand out, ones concerning the quality of teaching and ones concerning equitable pay. The problem of quality is primarily the result of the high turnover rate among adjuncts. The pay that they receive in most cases is so low as to make it necessary for them to seek other kinds of work. As a result, a disturbing number of the adjuncts that are teaching at any given time are inexperienced.

The goal should be to minimize this kind of adjunct teaching at Notre Dame. Departments need to have enough regular faculty to staff the courses that they offer. The use of adjuncts in effect creates a two-tiered faculty, those who are given both respect and a reasonable salary and those who are given neither. Moreover, Notre Dame has an obligation to provide its undergraduates with proven teachers in even the most basic courses that they take. We recognize that there may be situations in which it is not feasible to staff all of a department's courses with regular faculty, but this should be the goal. In those few cases where the goal cannot be met, adjunct faculty who have served with distinction over a number of years must be given a respectable salary. This will lower the turnover rate among them and thus help insure quality teaching. It is also the fair thing to do.

5. Generally graduate students should not have sole responsibility for teaching a course. When this is not feasible, only advanced graduate students should have sole responsibility for a course and they should be carefully selected, trained, and supervised. Even for those graduate students employed as graders, discussion leaders, laboratory assistants, and the like, there should be department programs of training and supervision.

Graduate students do two kinds of teaching at Notre Dame. Some are employed as graders, discussion leaders, or laboratory assistants. For them this is often an important first step towards a career in higher education. A few departments carefully supervise the work of these assistants, but many other departments have virtually no policies and no supervision whatsoever. For the sake of these teaching assistants and for the sake of the undergraduate students whom they teach, departments must have clear policies regarding the role and work of assistants. Moreover, where no program of training or direct supervision by regular faculty is in place, such a program must be introduced. We also recommend that there be college-wide teaching awards for assistants. A significant amount of the teaching at the university is done by graduate students who lead discussion groups or run laboratory sessions. Those who do an outstanding job should be recognized.

Other graduate students are given sole responsibility for their courses. In most of these cases departments are using their graduate students to help meet university-authorized teaching obligations, such as the obligation to staff sections in the freshman writing program. However, a few departments use graduate students to teach their introductory courses as well. In general, this latter use of graduate students should be discouraged and for the same reason that the use of adjuncts to teach these courses should be discouraged. Notre Dame's goal is to provide the best possible undergraduate education, and as a rule this can be better achieved by regular faculty than by graduate students. If a department chronically lacks sufficient faculty to do its teaching, the solution is to add faculty rather than to make extensive use of graduate students. One of the most attractive features of a Notre Dame undergraduate education has been that a large percentage of courses, even introductory ones, are taught by regular faculty. This is a practice that stands in contrast to that found at many other universities, and it is a practice that should be maintained. We recognize that there will be exceptions to this recommendation. In a few departments it would not be feasible to eliminate altogether the use of graduate students teaching courses on their own. However, where an extensive use of graduate students remains necessary, only advanced graduate students (third year and beyond) should be used. Moreover, they should be carefully selected, adequately prepared, and closely supervised. Only those who have proven themselves in their assisting duties should be given sole responsibility for a course. In addition, all such graduate students should receive detailed, prior instruction concerning the material that their departments expect them to cover in their courses. Finally, while teaching the course, they should have frequent opportunities to discuss their teaching both with regular faculty and with one another.

SET #2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OTHER UNIVERSITY INITIATIVES

1. A Center for the Improvement and Support of Teaching should be established at Notre Dame.

We have centers and institutes for a variety of purposes. We need one whose energies are focused exclusively on the promotion of good teaching. Teaching centers at other universities (e.g. Stanford, Vanderbilt) provide services for the entire teaching staff, but they provide an especially wide range of services for new faculty and graduate students. For example, they video-tape classes or discussion groups and then critique them. For those who do not feel comfortable with this, they offer small-group analyses of courses in progress, surveying at the mid-point of a course the reactions of the students to it. They provide advice on constructing workable syllabi as well as information about sound testing techniques. They work with departments to create training programs for graduate students on how to lead discussion groups or how to run lab sessions, and then they help run these programs. They develop special workshops to help international graduate students meet their teaching-related responsibilities. They publish pamphlets that provide new faculty, adjuncts, and graduate assistants with reliable information about the administrative details of teaching (the grading system, the final examination requirement, the procedures for ordering books and putting books on reserve, the way to get a room for special sessions, etc.). Most importantly, they work with departments to devise policies and programs individualized to their needs. Educational Media currently provides some such services to faculty and graduate students, but these services could be extensively increased as part of the Notre Dame Center.

In addition, we recommend that the Center be used as a forum to raise issues of national importance on education. The ideal center would be one that not only improves teaching at Notre Dame but one that also acts as national lobbyist for quality teaching in higher education. This is an area for Notre Dame to be at the forefront, and the right kind of teaching center with the right kind of director and the right kind of support from the university could help put Notre Dame there.

There should be a national search for an appropriate director of the center. The teaching centers that have been effective at other universities are run by directors who have credibility with the faculty, and this requires that the director have solid academic credentials. The Notre Dame Center for Teaching should be funded at a level that will allow it to have an immediate impact. It should have enough funding to provide a wide variety of services to faculty and graduate students, and it should also have enough funding to provide grants to faculty who propose innovative teaching ideas, much as other institutes fund promising research proposals. To the best of our knowledge, no existing teaching center provides such funding, but it is an idea that need not cost a great deal but that would go a long way towards demonstrating Notre Dame's commitment to quality teaching. Grants of this sort would help generate an environment in which faculty are encouraged to find creative means to improve their teaching.

We recognize that there are limits to what a teaching center can accomplish. No teaching center can help faculty improve the intellectual content of their courses. Here faculty must rely on their own reading and upon their colleagues. More generally, no teaching center can be a substitute for interaction among faculty who teach in the same areas (sitting in on each other's classes, discussing syllabi, assignments, tests, etc.). This remains one of the best and least costly ways to improve teaching. But even here, the best teaching centers are of help. They work with departments to devise ways in which such interaction can be encouraged. Similarly, although a teaching center will not be able to help faculty improve the content of their courses, it can be of help in making faculty more aware of the skills that are needed to teach that content. These skills can be taught to those who are willing to learn. Not everyone can become a great teacher, but most can become better teachers if they work to develop the communicative and organizational skills that are needed for successful teaching. A center, whose services are available to faculty on a voluntary basis, can help them develop these skills. As importantly, a center would have the time and the expertise that departments often lack to prepare graduate students adequately for their teaching-related duties.

2. Notre Dame needs many more classrooms and much better classrooms.

The expanding research capacities of the university have created increased needs for faculty offices as well as offices for new centers and institutes. The result has been a loss of classroom space. Seventeen classrooms have been lost since 1980, ten in the last two years. These have often been prime classrooms, especially in terms of student-faculty interaction, being conveniently located near faculty and departmental offices. Completion of the proposed new classroom facility must be one of the university's highest priorities, and in general there should be a moratorium on further conversion of classroom space until this facility is constructed.

Not only is there a problem with the total number of usable classrooms, there is also a problem with the quality of existing classrooms. The few large classrooms on campus tend not to be well-suited for lecture purposes because of poor lighting, poor seating, or lack of blackboard space. Existing labs and demonstration facilities are often in dilapidated condition, sometimes to the point of raising concerns about safety. There is a lack of suitable facilities in the arts. More generally, advanced audio-visual equipment is needed in much greater percentage of classrooms than is the case at present. There also must be an increased availability of computers for teaching purposes. However, the most pressing problem is that of turning existing classrooms into rooms with good sightlines, good lighting, good acoustics, overhead projection, and sufficient blackboard space. At present such basic classrooms are in short supply. This is a major problem that must be addressed soon.

There is also a critical need to create additional social space where professors and students can meet in a relaxed setting. One of the most frequent complaints of Notre Dame undergraduates concerns a lack of interaction with their professors. Properly designed facilities can encourage such interaction. Future buildings at Notre Dame should have adequate social space, but in addition creative ways must be found to use existing space so as to promote contact between professors and students outside the classroom.

3. Concrete steps must be taken to correct the widespread perception that teaching is not really important or at least not as important as research in promotion and reappointment decisions.

It is widely believed that very poor teaching can hurt you but that superior teaching will not help you very much in promotion decisions. It is also widely believed that if one is a highly productive scholar, one does not need to worry about teaching. This is not to say that those who have been tenured over the last ten years have not been strong teachers. They generally have been. Nevertheless, there is much skepticism about how much weight is given to good teaching in the tenure and reappointment process. Some of the doubts arise from the observation that the highest committee on these matters at the university, the Provost's Advisory Committee, contains no faculty who are engaged in full-time teaching and research. The feeling is that if there were regular faculty on this committee, it would help increase the committee's appreciation for good research, good teaching and the proper balance between the two. The present members of the committee report that in all but a very few cases they follow the recommendations of the department's Committee on Appointments and Promotions. So, there is already adequate input to the committee from the faculty who should have such input — namely, the faculty of the candidate's department.

But regardless of the department's influence, measures need to be taken to correct the perception that teaching is not taken seriously in promotion and reappointment decisions. Some of this can be accomplished at the departmental level. Departments must generate more and better information about the teaching of their candidates, information to supplement the Teacher and Course Evaluations. Teaching can be taken seriously in these decisions only to the degree that departments are serious in gathering information about it. However, measures ought also to be taken at the university level. Increased rhetoric about the importance of teaching is a first step, but it also would be helpful to add several senior faculty to the Provost's Advisory Committee. Each college might nominate a number of senior faculty who are both respected scholars and good teachers, and then the provost could select from these lists several faculty to participate in the committee's discussions of promotion and reappointment cases for that year. It would be undesirable to have specific faculty members forced upon the committee. The committee must remain a cooperative one and one in which the Provost has full confidence. To ensure this, the Provost must have some discretion with respect to the faculty members who serve on the committee.

Placing a few good teachers who are also respected scholars on the committee will help dispel the perception, however accurate or inaccurate, that the committee does not sufficiently balance research-related considerations against teaching-related considerations. Faculty tend to distrust committees from which they are excluded, and this distrust is especially great when the committee is charged with making assessments concerning the quality of teaching and research done by the faculty. Such committees foster a them-versus-us attitude that is counterproductive for everyone. At other universities (e.g., Princeton and Stanford), faculty have participated in personnel decisions at the university level for a number of years. It is time for them to do so at Notre Dame as well. Since the Provost's Committee is an advisory committee, the presence of faculty on it has little potential for harm and considerable potential for enhancing the spirit of community at Notre Dame.

4. The campus bookstore should be dramatically upgraded.

A first-rate teaching and research university needs a first-rate bookstore. The bookstore should be regarded as one of the major intellectual resources of the Notre Dame teaching and research community. It must have a wide range of books in stock. This is especially pressing for Notre Dame given its location. The administrators of the bookstore report that they would welcome a chance to stock a greater variety of books but that they presently lack the space to do so. We recommend that there be a commitment to expand the present building or to build a new facility to house the bookstore, with the understanding that the additional space is to be devoted to an expansion of the number and the variety of books that are kept in stock.

SET #3: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTAL INITIATIVES

1. Each department should be mandated to devote at least one meeting a year to teaching.

The primary responsibility for improving teaching remains at the departmental level. The departments must take this responsibility seriously. It is not too much to expect that each department devote one departmental meeting a year to discussing ways of improving its teaching. The departments themselves are in the best position to evaluate what they are doing well and what they are not doing well. The annual meeting must be carefully planned. It might focus on a different aspect of teaching each year — e.g. the curriculum, the content of introductory courses, the requirements for majors, the teaching done by graduate students, the evaluation of teaching, etc. The department should submit a brief report of the meeting to its dean.

We also recommend that one of these meetings consider what use the department can make of the teaching center. It is especially important for each department to consider what services the center might provide to new faculty and to graduate students that have teaching responsibilities. A teaching center will do little good if there is no activity at the departmental level, but activity at the departmental level can be enhanced by a good center. Cooperation between the center and the departments can be aided by regular communcation between the two. The director of the teaching center should have the responsibility of keeping departments informed of the center's resources whereas departmental chairpersons should have the responsibility of keeping the center informed of their departments' needs.

2. The Deans should mandate that every department devise for itself procedures to govern the evaluation of teaching in re-appointment and promotion decisions.

Although all departments use Teacher and Course Evaluations (TCE's) as a measure of teaching effectiveness, different departments place different emphases upon them. The emphasis that is placed upon the TCE's is in most cases inversely related to the number of other sources of information that a department gathers about teaching. These other sources vary significantly from department to department. In a few departments classroom visitations are used to supplement the TCE's. Most departments engage in some sort of review of course syllabi. Some appoint members of the department's Appointments and Promotions committee to discuss with candidates their teaching. Many departments use informal student feedback, and a few solicit the detailed opinions of trusted majors.

For the most part, the evaluation of teaching, by whatever means, takes place only when it is needed for re-appointment and promotion. And in many departments, an evaluation of teaching is at best an incidental component of promotions to full professor. Beyond the re-appointment and promotion years, little is done by way of systematic evaluation or supervision of teaching. It is management by exception.

The fact that a variety of methods are used to evaluate teaching across the university is not a cause for concern. Given the different kinds of teaching that are done in various departments, this is to be expected. What is a cause for some concern is the feeling that the evaluation of teaching is occasionally done in a haphazard, non-systematic way. Just as there is no single way to be a good teacher, there is no single way to evaluate teaching. But departments need to be reflective about the best way to evaluate the teaching that is done by their faculty. If they have not already done so, each department should come up with a general plan for the evaluation of teaching and should make this plan public to their faculty and their dean. The plan should be simple and feasible. It should not require unrealistic commitments of time by either the candidate or the senior faculty. Moreover, the plan might very well be flexible, taking into account candidates' own views concerning the most appropriate ways to evaluate their teaching.

Special care must be taken by everyone involved in the promotion and re-appointment processes against any mechanical use of the TCE's. There is a considerable amount of distrust of the TCE's. Many faculty feel that the TCE's only measure whether students have a good impression of a professor. But even if this is so, this in itself is significant and warrants the TCE's having some role in the evaluation of teaching. After all, not making a good impression on students is a significant handicap in educating them. On the other hand, effective teaching does not absolutely require that one make a good impression upon one's students, and it is quite possible to convey a good impression and still not effectively educate.

Good teaching is essentially a matter of how much and how well students learn, and of course this is not easy to measure. Still there are a number of accessible factors that are directly relevant to good teaching. For example, the following is a statement of the criteria that are used by one department in its assessments of teaching:

> A first minimal condition of effective teaching is disciplinary competence. A professor who does not have a grasp of the material commensurate to the level of the course being taught cannot help the students learn. A second minimal condition is a sense of responsibility. Effective teaching requires that professors take their jobs seriously by preparing adequately for classes, not skipping or shortening classes without good reasons, maintaining appropriate standards of student performance, and treating students with fairness and respect. Beyond these minimal requirements, there is the central pedagogical virtue of clarity. An effective teacher must be able to present course material in an accessible way. There is also the need for good pedagogical judgement concerning the amount and difficulty of material discussed in the course and the rate at which it is covered. If the level of discussion is too far above or below the abilities and background of the students, then even the clearest presentations will be ineffective. A final factor in effective teaching is the ability to stimulate students. Sometimes the material is in itself so attractive that students are adequately stimulated by nothing more than a clear presentation of it. But in most cases, stimulating teaching will also depend upon the professor's personal qualities. Here it is important to realize that some teachers engage students through exuberance and drama, others through friendliness and quiet wit, still others through a sense of high moral or intellectual seriousness. The most overtly spectacular teaching need not be the most genuinely stimulating.

This list is an example of one department's attempt to generate criteria of effective teaching. The list is obviously not complete, and just as obviously there is much room for variations and refinements of these criteria. Our recommendation is not that this list be taken as definitive. It is offered only as an example. Rather, our recommendation is that each department work out its own criteria and that they then also work out their own procedures for determining whether candidates for re-appointment and promotion have met these criteria. The departments need to decide these issues for themselves.

Having said this however, it is our opinion that ordinarily the best judges of teaching effectiveness are other faculty in the same department who have visited the professor's classes, seen video-tapes of the professor's lectures, studied the professor's syllabi, discussed with the professor his or her preferred method of teaching, etc. This requires an investment of time, and as importantly it also requires moving away from the idea that teaching is essentially a private activity. Teaching should be thought of as something for which (like research) professors have their colleagues as an interested audience. Otherwise faculty are likely to have a set of attitudes about the evaluation of teaching that are difficult to reconcile with one another. They will insist that teaching be an important consideration in promotions, but they will distrust TCE's as a way to measure teaching success, and they will also be reluctant to allow classroom visitations, videotaping, and other methods of evaluation as a way to supplement the TCE's.

The way out of this dilemma is for faculty to change their attitudes. Departments with the help of the teaching center need to find ways to encourage a climate in which teaching is thought of as a public activity. Teaching is like almost everything else. It is often helpful to have other people look at how well one is doing it. Those teaching a course are not always in the best position to judge how much students are learning. Besides, it is a healthy thing for a department to have an open attitude about its teaching. Junior faculty should be encouraged to visit the classes given by senior faculty. This can be enormously helpful for them in thinking about their own teaching. In addition, it makes any visits by senior faculty to their classes less threatening.

3. Each department should have a mentor system or another similar system to assist junior faculty in their first-year of teaching.

The first year of teaching is commonly the most difficult for junior faculty. Departments have a responsibility to provide their junior faculty with the support, encouragement, and guidance that they need to become successful teachers. One way to do so is through the establishment of a mentor system in which junior faculty are assigned to (or themselves choose) a senior member of the department who serves as their advisor about teaching as well as research. The idea is to provide an opportunity for junior faculty to get advice about their teaching from experienced teachers prior to the evaluations that are mandated in reappointment and tenure years. Departments must not adopt a sink-or-swim attitude towards their junior faculty. The attitude instead should be the active one of trying to help them meet Notre Dame's standards for teaching and research. There might be many ways of doing so. For instance, sometimes the problem is one of language. If so, the faculty member must be urged to take advantage of the courses already available at the university to increase proficiency in English. But whatever the problem, departments need to work with the junior faculty to correct it.

4. The importance of teaching at Notre Dame needs to be emphasized at all stages in the hiring process.

Two points are especially signficant here. First, the most straightforward way to ensure outstanding teaching at Notre Dame is to hire outstanding teachers. Of course, it is not always easy to determine in advance who will become an outstanding teacher, but ordinarily candidates for positions at Notre Dame will have had some previous teaching experience. Their teaching records need to be examined with care and taken into account as an important consideration in hiring decisions. Second, it should be made obvious to everyone who is a candidate for a position at Notre Dame, whether this be a position as an assistant professor or as a chaired professor, that Notre Dame is a place that takes undergraduate education very seriously. This fact should be emphasized at all stages in the hiring process, from the initial advertisement of the position to the on-campus interview. Emphasizing the importance of teaching will make a position at Notre Dame seem unattractive to only a very few applicants, and they are probably better off elsewhere.

5. Every department should be encouraged to find a feasible way to initiate a senior thesis or senior project for its majors.

Many departments already have such a requirement, and many others make the opportunity available to their majors. The departments that do neither should work towards one or the other. The goal should be to encourage as many Notre Dame undergraduates as possible in their senior years to be engaged in some sort of research-oriented project, one that allows them to bring together what they have learned in their previous major courses. This makes good pedagogical sense, and it would be welcomed by students. The students who are already involved in such projects are almost uniformly enthusiastic about them. Moreover, this is another way in which the increasing research component of the university can have a positive influence upon undergraduate education.

6. Departments must more carefully monitor their introductory and other lower-level courses.

We have already noted the effects that staffing shortages have had upon these courses. Too many are taught by graduate students and adjuncts, and too many of those that are taught by regular faculty have large enrollments. But in addition, these problems have been made worse in some cases by a measure of neglect. To be sure, many departments take their responsibilities seriously and staff these courses with their better teachers. Indeed, they often see this as in their self-interest, since it is a good strategy for attracting majors. But in other departments, these courses suffer from inattention, especially in comparison with courses for advanced majors and for graduate students. And in a few departments, the problems with these courses have become serious. Admittedly, the departments with the most serious problems are ones with serious staffing shortages. Some departments are faced with a national shortage of qualified instructors (e.g., Mathematics) and others are faced with an increased demand for their courses (e.g., Modern Languages). These difficulties place departments in a bind. But bind or not, something must be done and done soon to correct these problems. The departments, their Deans, and the university as a whole must devote the resources, energies and will necessary to ensure that the teaching of introductory and other lower-level courses at Notre Dame meets the highest standards.

7. Every department should re-examine the balance between their undergraduate and graduate offerings, and strive for an arrangement that slights neither program. The Deans and the Vice-President of Advanced Studies should monitor this re-examination.

Departments have sometimes simply presumed the essential health of their undergraduate programs and focused much of their energies upon their graduate programs. There has been a large increase in the number and variety of graduate courses offered at the university. In most cases the upgrading of the graduate programs required this increase. But many faculty and administrators indicated to us that there is considerable fat in the graduate offerings of a number of departments. In some departments there are unhealthy notions of entitlement: everyone is entitled to a graduate course every year, regardless of general departmental needs. In other departments there are simply too many tracks that graduate students can take through them, tracks that obligate the departments to staff courses for which there is only a tiny enrollment. Departments need to make hard choices about these issues, keeping in mind the effect that a proliferation of graduate courses has upon their undergraduate curriculum.

8. Every department training graduate students for research-and-teaching positions should institute a program in conjunction with the teaching center to help prepare its students for a career in teaching.

Notre Dame should be a place that not only has a reputation for having outstanding teachers but also for developing them. But in general, there has been very little concern for the kind of teachers we are graduating. In this respect Notre Dame is no different from most other Ph.D. institutions, but we should be better. It is now widely noted that the training of secondary teachers is often scandalous in its obsession with pedagogical technique and in its absence of concern with content. Secondary history teachers, for example, often know quite a bit about how to teach history but on the other hand they may know relatively little history to teach. The problem at the university level is just the opposite. The concern is exclusively on content with no concern at all with pedagogical technique. This is equally scandalous. There are teaching skills that need to be learned if one is to be a successful teacher, and the learning process can be greatly eased by workshops co-sponsored by the departments and the Notre Dame Center for Teaching. Notre Dame can be and should be a national leader on this score.

Conclusion

We have forwarded a number of recomendations in this report, ones that we think would improve teaching at Notre Dame. However, more important than any of these recommendations is the resolve to devote the resources and energies necessary to ensure that teaching at Notre Dame is of the highest quality. The goal must be to maintain an atmosphere at Notre Dame in which professors can take pride and satisfaction in their teaching and in which they can be expected to be rewarded for doing it well. This is a goal for everyone. It is a goal for the administrators who make decisions concerning how to allocate resources; it is a goal for department chairpersons who oversee promotions and salary raises; it is a goal for senior faculty who are most directly responsible for shaping junior faculty attitudes about the importance of teaching at Notre Dame; and it is a goal for junior faculty who can be as inquisitive about ways to improve their teaching as they are about ways to improve their research.

There are national trends that make this a difficult goal. The recent Carnegie Report on undergraduate education calls for a renewed commitment to teaching, but it recognizes that "the American professoriate has been profoundly shaped by the conviction that research is the cornerstone of the profession." The report notes also that this conviction is reinforced by the fact that professors receive lucrative offers and prestigious grants not because of their teaching but rather because of their research. Teaching is not taken very seriously in the academic marketplace. Notre Dame cannot ignore this national trend. If it is to to be competitive for the best minds, Notre Dame must continue to develop an environment in which powerful research is encouraged. Nevertheless, its identity as a place that treasures teaching excellence is its most important resource, and moreover it is possible for Notre Dame to keep this identity while aggressively upgrading its research capabilities. It is not easy and it is not inexpensive, but it can be done. We think that our recommendations point the way. There must be more faculty. Departments must generate more and better information about the teaching of their candidates for promotion. A center for teaching should be established to provide the support and information that faculty and graduate students need to improve their teaching. These and our other recommendations are made with the belief that Notre Dame must be aggressive in its attempts to develop an environment in which outstanding teaching is encouraged.

The university has made enormous strides in recent years. It is becoming a place of great intellectual vitality. Still, all too often students have not been the beneficiaries of this. It is an often heard complaint that Notre Dame students tend not to be intellectually curious. But if so, the response must be to seek remedies rather than excuses. It is unacceptable to place the blame upon the kind of students that Notre Dame attracts or upon its location or upon its traditions. These are dodges. Extremely bright students come to Notre Dame. To the degree that they are unshaped and unmoved by intellectual concerns, it is our responsibility, the responsibility of the faculty and the administration, to change this, and the primary places to do so are in our classrooms, laboratories, and studios. It is our responsibility to inspire them to learn.

THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON RESIDENTIALITY

Presented to
Rev. David T. Tyson, C.S.C.
Vice President, Student Affairs
University of Notre Dame

March 1988

MANDATE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE TASK FORCE

In April of 1987, Vice President for Student Affairs Rev. David T. Tyson, C.S.C. appointed the Task Force on Residentiality. The mandate of the Task Force was to examine the question of residentiality in its broadest context, including:

1) the quality, sufficiency and variety of living facilities for undergraduate and graduate students;
2) the criteria for selection and evaluation of head staff and resident assistants;
3) the structural support available to hall staffs;
4) the standard of conduct for student residents;
5) the provision of services to meet the social, religious, cultural, volunteer and personal needs of resident students;
6) the relationship between residential life and the academic mission of the University.

The following persons served as members of the Task Force:

Dr. Ann Firth (Chair), Director, Residence Life

Ms. Laurine Bink, Student Body Vice President

Rev. Francis Cafarelli, C.S.C., Adjunct Instructor, Freshman Writing Program

Rev. Joseph Carey, C.S.C., Assistant Director, Financial Aid

Mr. Robert Challenger, Junior Student

Mr. Kenneth Durgans, Director, Minority Student Affairs (Fall 1987)

Sr. Annette (Jo) Giarrante, O.S.F., Campus Ministry Staff

Dr. Leslie Griffin, Assistant Professor, Theology

Mr. Brendan Judge, Student Judicial Coordinator

Rev. John Lahey, C.S.C., Instructor, Theology

Dr. Jerry Marley, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering

Ms. Catherine O'Hare, Assistant Rector, Lyons Hall

Ms. Michelle Parent, Resident Assistant

Mr. Martin Rodgers, Senior Student (Spring 1988)

Ms. Evelyn Reinebold, Director, Student Residences

Mr. Timothy Salmon, Co-Chairman, Hall Presidents' Council

The Task Force met as a group on a bi-weekly basis during the 1987 Fall Semester and on a weekly basis during the 1988 Spring Semester, to discuss a broad range of issues related to residential life. We addressed specific issues of interest and concern by dividing into six subcommittees.

Each subcommittee developed a report which was reviewed and acted upon by the entire Task Force. The work of the subcommittees consisted of gathering data and of communicating with a broad range of persons within the University community. Members of the Task Force met with hall staff members, students, providers of student services, faculty, University administrators and members of the Holy Cross Congregation.

GOAL STATEMENT

Residential life has a rich tradition at the University of Notre Dame. In the earliest days of the University, student boarders lived in separate dormitories in the Administration Building. University historian Thomas Schlereth, author of The University of Notre Dame: A Portrait of Its History and Campus, states that "Before separate halls were constructed, a student derived his campus identity from the dormitory in which he slept". In the late 1880's, Notre Dame began to replace its system of communal dormitories with residential halls and private rooms. The first of these was Sorin Hall, which opened in May of 1888. Sorin contained sixty private rooms, "large enough to encourage study and at the same time small enough to discourage visiting". One of the major reasons for the construction of residence halls with private rooms was the academic success of those few students who had managed to live in single rooms in the Administration Building prior to Sorin's construction. President Walsh and Father John Zahm faced some opposition to the construction of these halls but the new model of residentiality was nonetheless established. The construction of Walsh, Howard, Morrissey and Lyons Halls followed the construction of Sorin and reenforced the single room, on-campus model of residential life at Notre Dame.

In the past one hundred years, Notre Dame residence life has developed and expanded to meet the changing needs of its student population. There are now 27 residence halls at Notre Dame. Eighty percent of Notre Dame undergraduates--a percentage much higher than most college campuses in this country--reside on-campus. Three of these buildings house graduate students, while 15 contain undergraduate men, and nine hold undergraduate women. One hundred sixty-two students still reside in Sorin Hall, although most of them no longer inhabit single rooms. In the fall of 1988, five hundred women will move into Knott and Siegfried Halls, the University's newest residence facilities.

In whatever hall they inhabit, students learn that residentiality is one of the hallmarks of life at the University of Notre Dame. Throughout Notre Dame history, students have developed friendships in the residence halls which have endured for life. In this environment, generations of students have been encouraged to develop their intellectual skills by resident faculty and administrators. It is there that ministers--whether priests, religious or lay--have been present to encourage students to spend their lives in the service of God and neighbor. Such positive interaction among students, staff and faculty, in pursuit of intellectual, moral and spiritual development, has been a valued accomplishment of residence life in the history of the University.

In the midst of changing physical facilities, a larger and more diverse student population, and a changing society outside of Notre Dame, the University retains its commitment to these essential goals of residence life. The University of Notre Dame defines its mission in the Priorities and Commitments for Excellence Report (1982): "...to be influential in the enrichment of culture, society, and the church, through the education of young men and women as concerned and enlightened citizens with a religious, a Christian and, more specifically, a Catholic, sense of values." This concern for the education and development of the whole person is at the heart of our residential system. Residence life at Notre Dame must provide more than the necessities of room and board; it must encourage and foster students' spiritual, moral, intellectual and social growth.

Notre Dame is committed to the development of these qualities in all aspects of university life. But a combination of factors -- including the respected tradition of residentiality at the University and the large numbers of students in residence--offers the halls a special opportunity to promote growth in all of these aspects of student life. In the halls, students and staff encourage the community values central to the life of the university.

Notre Dame is an academic community, committed to the intellectual development of its students. In the residence halls, students should encounter an environment which fosters intellectual pursuits. There they should find an atmosphere which encourages critical discussion of ideas encountered in the classroom; there they should be able to visit scholars in residence. There too should they learn that wisdom is a life-long quest, which must continue when students leave the university.

Notre Dame is also a community committed to moral values. In its residence halls, as in all sectors of the university, it advocates respect for other persons, and fosters integrity and virtue in personal development. The University of Notre Dame encourages those in residence to become mature and responsible participants in hall life, in preparation for their life after graduation as responsible citizens in society.

Notre Dame residence halls also provide an environment which supports spiritual awareness and growth in its students. Students of varying religious backgrounds are encouraged to reflect upon their moral and intellectual commitments from the perspective of faith. Community celebrations of liturgy are important moments in residence hall life. Such celebrations, along with many other hall events, testify to the importance of the religious quest at Notre Dame.

In the midst of such intellectual, moral and spiritual development, Notre Dame residence halls are communities which promote friendship. Shared life in halls provides students with the occasion to participate in relationships based on equality, in which acceptance of real persons, in their strengths and in their weaknesses, occurs. Such friendships both challenge and console students as they confront the pleasures and anxieties of student life. One of the legacies of Notre Dame life has been the friendships, begun in undergraduate halls, which have matured throughout the years, and which have become life-long sources of support and encouragement.

In all of these aspects of residence life at Notre Dame--spiritual and moral as well as social and intellectual--students are encouraged to develop those qualities which will prepare them for life after graduation. Thus students should develop in the community of our halls a capacity for independence as well as for commitment, and should acquire those qualities which will serve them in their lives as professionals, as citizens, and as members of families.

In order to support the goals of residential life at Notre Dame, the Task Force offers a number of recommendations for the improvement of existing conditions. We have divided these recommendations into three areas: Personnel; Residential Environment; and Physical Facilities.

12

PERSONNEL

The model of community in Notre Dame residence halls is facilitated by staff members committed to a pastoral approach to their work. At Notre Dame, hall rectors and assistant rectors are more than hall managers; they are ministers selected because of their ability to contribute to the moral, intellectual and spiritual development of students through their own pastoral talents.

Throughout the years of residence life at Notre Dame, such a ministerial model for hall staff has been exemplified by members of the Holy Cross community. Many of our residence halls bear the names of Holy Cross priests who spent their lives in service of their students. Many students have gained their sense of the Notre Dame tradition from Holy Cross personnel, who have served as models of intellectual, moral and spiritual development.

The Holy Cross community still plays a central part in residence life at Notre Dame. Now, in the 1980's, the ministerial model affirmed for hall personnel at Notre Dame has been deeply affected by the understanding of ministry espoused by the Second Vatican Council. Such a model affirms the importance of lay ministry to the mission of the church; it affirms as well the ecumenical dimension of ministry in the broader Christian community. Thus the pastoral model for residence life at Notre Dame supports a ministry in which sisters, brothers and priests of Holy Cross, as well as of other religious communities, collaborate with laywomen and laymen, both single and married. All of these ministers serve students through their work and through their personal example, and call them to participate in the whole venture of residentiality.

Rectors

Rectors fulfill multiple roles within the residence halls. As educators and advisors, they encourage and facilitate the intellectual, moral, and spiritual development of the students. As pastors and liturgists, they coordinate the celebration of weekly liturgies within the hall, bringing residents together as a community of faith. As disciplinarians, they enforce hall and University rules, teaching students important lessons about respect for oneself and for others. As building managers, they maintain the physical condition of the residence hall.

The demands of the work in the halls are great. Long hours and lack of privacy, together with the diversity of responsibilities, make the rector's job difficult and at times highly stressful. Rectors often do not see the fruits of their labors. Instead, they must trust that their efforts will have meaning and value in the future lives of students.

Generally, Rectors have expressed a need for increased professional support. Among the rectors themselves, there is an informal network of support, with weekly meetings of the rectors on each quad. While many find this support helpful, they also seek frequent contact with the Student Affairs Senior Staff as a source of affirmation. The lack of an existing structure to facilitate communication between the rectors and the Senior Staff has led, in some instances, to frustration and isolation among rectors. Rectors believe that greater efforts could be made by the University to foster their professional development and to encourage collaboration.

In response to the concerns voiced by the rectors in this regard, the Task Force has formulated a number of recommendations.

1. In the interest of promoting the professional development of rectors, their duties, prerogatives, and responsibilities should be clearly defined

by the Office of Student Affairs. On the basis of this job description, rectors should be provided with objective, identifiable criteria to be used in the evaluation of their performance, in addition to the results of the evaluations presently completed by hall residents, resident assistants and assistant rectors. As part of this process, rectors should be asked to formulate their job goals at the beginning of each academic year, and progress towards meeting these goals could be assessed together with the Senior Staff. Serious consideration should be given to restructuring the evaluation process to allow each rector to meet with the Senior Staff several times over the course of an academic year.

2. We recommend the hiring of a professional staff person, as part of the Residence Life staff, to serve as a resource person for hall staffs. This individual's job responsibilities would include designing and implementing orientation and the continuing education programs for rectors, assistant rectors and RAs; facilitating and encouraging collaboration between rectors and the Senior Staff; facilitating interaction between male and female rectors; formulating comprehensive orientation programs for new rectors to assist them in making the adjustment to life in a Notre Dame residence hall; and assisting rectors in the hiring, training, and evaluation of their staffs. This individual would also play an important part in coordinating retreats and reflection groups with Campus Ministry for rectors, assistant rectors, and RAs, in order to afford hall staff members an opportunity to reflect upon their experience in the hall.

3. The Task Force recommends the establishment of a professional network for rectors with campus ministry staffs and residence hall personnel on other campuses who are similarly engaged in ministry in residence halls, with rectors attending national and regional conferences on issues relating to

residential life. Involvement in such a national network would not only be a source of support and information for rectors, but could also be valuable to the University in terms of recruiting qualified individuals to fill vacated rector positions.

4. Given the importance of the rector to our residential system, it is crucial that the University continue to attract highly qualified individuals to this position. In order to do so, however, the University must commit the financial resources necessary to recruit and retain these individuals. At present, salaries for rectors are not commensurate with the responsibilities and demands of the job. Moreover, the compensation scale for rectors does not allow for merit increases after the third year. As a consequence, there is neither incentive for professional development nor opportunity for advancement.

The Task Force recommends, therefore, that the salaries of rectors be increased and the compensation scale be changed to allow for increases beyond the third year. Length of tenure and size of residence hall should be considered in determining rectors' salaries, as should excellence of service.

Assistant Rectors

There has been a significant change in the position of assistant rector in recent years. In the past, most assistant rectors were professed religious with teaching or administrative responsibilities who filled the position of assistant rector for several years. Today most assistant rectors are graduate students who serve in that capacity for a year or two.

The change in this position has resulted in confusion about the role of the assistant rector. In some halls, assistant rectors have a great deal of responsibility and serve in pastoral roles. In other halls, their responsibilities are very limited. There is a need for greater consistency and for a clarification of expectations for assistant rectors. The assistant rectors themselves have expressed a desire for shared responsibility and increased collaboration with rectors and the Student Affairs Senior Staff.

1. The Task Force recommends that the Office of Student Affairs define the duties, prerogatives and responsibilities of assistant rectors. We recognize that the assistant rector's duties may vary from hall to hall, depending upon the particular needs of the hall, and the personal strengths and style of the rector. Using the job description provided by Student Affairs as a guide, rectors should define their specific expectations of the assistant rectors and share their expectations with the Senior Staff. Further, in order to foster professional growth, rectors should be encouraged to conduct formal evaluations of their assistant rectors over the course of the year.

2. While it is true that the majority of assistant rectors are graduate students who leave that position upon the completion of their studies, there have been others for whom the job of assistant rector has been a preparation for the position of rector. The assistant rector position is an excellent training ground for the rector position. The Task Force encourages Student Affairs to actively recruit qualified individuals for the position of assistant rectors, who might eventually be interested in and qualified for the position of rector.

Resident Assistants

Resident Assistants play an important role in our residence halls. They serve as peer advisors and counselors, and assist the head staff in enforcing hall and University rules. The Resident Assistants' job is a challenging one, as they balance their responsibilities as students and as employees of the University.

The Task Force was very favorably impressed with the personal qualities and level of commitment we encountered among the RAs. Generally, the morale among RAs was good and most found their work rewarding. However, RAs did express some dissatisfaction with the present orientation and training programs.

The Task Force makes the following recommendations with regard to the hiring, training, and evaluation of Resident Assistants.

1. The Office of Residence Life, in conjunction with representatives from the hall staffs, should work to institute an orientation program that is more specific, more concrete, and more practical. The orientation should give specific guidance to staff about how to deal effectively with difficult situations, e.g., those involving discipline as well as counseling problems. Some Resident Assistants have suggested that they would profit from a case study or role-playing approach to problems confronted in the dorm. All orientation and training programs for Resident Assistants should emphasize the positive goals of residential life at Notre Dame.

2. Rectors and assistant rectors should enhance the fundamental knowledge provided by Student Affairs training programs through in-hall training programs. One component of the orientation for rectors and assistant rectors should be designed to assist them in developing such programs and to allow for the sharing of ideas on this topic.

3. Rectors should be encouraged by the Senior Staff to evaluate their Resident Assistants at the end of each semester. At present, there is no structure for the evaluation of RAs.

4. The Office of Residence Life should assist rectors in establishing uniform criteria for the Resident Assistant selection process, in order to foster greater consistency across campus.

5. The Office of Residence Life, in conjunction with Campus Ministry, should plan retreats and reflection groups for RAs. Over the course of the year, many RAs have profound experiences, such as witnessing an intervention in the life of an alcoholic student, or assisting a student with an eating disorder. RAs should be provided with opportunities to reflect with others on the meaning of these experiences.

In Residence Personnel

In addition to hall staff personnel, Notre Dame also has faculty and administrators living in residence, most of whom are Holy Cross priests and brothers. While they have no administrative responsibilities within the hall, they complement the work of the hall staffs by serving as advisors and role models for students.

The Task Force emphasizes the importance of these persons in residence. We encourage those living in residence to take an active role in the spiritual, intellectual, moral and social life of the halls.

Support Services

The work of the hall staffs is supported by the efforts of many committed men and women within the University. Our discussion focused on four sources of support and interaction: Campus Ministry, the Counseling Center, Security, and Maintenance.

A. Campus Ministry

Residential life at Notre Dame is characterized by a deep spirituality, perhaps most evident in the well-attended and prayerful liturgies in the halls. Campus Ministry does much to foster this spirituality among students, by offering resources for the hall liturgies, opportunities for retreat and reflections, religious education programs, and spiritual counseling. Campus Ministry also identifies the needs of the hall staffs and helps them to develop as ministers. By offering retreats for hall staff members, it provides them with opportunities to reflect on their work with others engaged in similar ministries.

The Task Force has formulated two recommendations with regard to Campus Ministry.

1. The Task Force urges Campus Ministry to continue to offer resources for the celebration of liturgy within the residence halls. Campus Ministry can assist those halls which do not have an ordained priest resident in coordinating presiders for the celebration of sacraments.

2. We recommend that Campus Ministry be encouraged to offer more opportunities for retreat and reflection to hall staff members, working with the Office of Residence Life.

B. University Counseling Center

The Counseling Center serves as an important source of support for hall staffs. However, relations between the Counseling Center and the hall staffs have been strained at times. Much of the difficulty stems from a perceived conflict between the requirements of confidentiality and the obligations of pastoral care. Because rectors are charged with the care of the intellectual, moral and spiritual development of students, they require information when a student's psychological difficulties result in behavior which seriously interferes with his or her well-being or the well-being of others in the residence hall. The Counseling Center staff argues that when problems occur in a student's life, these problems can best be solved by limiting information and protecting confidentiality. The need for clarification from Student Affairs on these issues is critical.

Since the introduction of the Alcohol Policy four years ago, the University has become more proactive with regard to alcohol abuse. In instances where a student's negative behavior is believed to be related to alcohol abuse, hall staff or the Office of Residence Life may require that a student undergo an assessment of his or her alcohol use. In the case of such mandatory referral, the Counseling Center finds itself in the uncomfortable position of conducting the assessment and sharing the necessary information with the referral source, while at the same time attempting to establish the foundation of trust upon which a therapeutic relationship is based. Ideally, the assessment process should be separate from the provision of therapeutic services.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. The Office of Student Affairs should review the standard of confidentiality and establish procedures for the sharing of necessary information between the Counseling Center and rectors.
2. We recommend the hiring of an Intervention Specialist within the newly established Office of Alcohol Education, who would be equipped to conduct substance use assessments. Once the assessment is completed, those students needing further assistance could either take advantage of the services offered by the University Counseling Center or seek assistance at one of the local

substance abuse treatment centers. The Intervention Specialist would play a vital role in educating hall staffs to recognize and respond to students with alcohol and drug problems. Ideally, the Intervention Specialist would also be qualified to do assessments in cases involving food abuse, i.e., bulimia and anorexia.

C. Security

The Security Department offers a wide range of excellent services to the University community. One of the most important ways in which Security interacts with the hall staffs is to provide night monitors to the residence halls. At present, night monitors are employed only in the women's halls. The female rectors have identified a need to review the procedures used in recruiting, hiring and training of the night monitors. Furthermore, several male rectors have requested that monitors be present in the men's halls on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights, especially on football weekends.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force recommends that Security, working closely with the Office of Residence Life and the rectors, examine the procedures for recruiting, hiring and training night monitors and consider the possibility of expanding this service to include the men's residence halls.

D. Maintenance

Many rectors expressed frustration regarding the amount of time and energy spent in maintaining the physical condition of the residence halls. Particularly in the larger halls, caring for the physical plant is almost a full-time job. These tasks divert rectors' time and attention away from their pastoral duties.

There was dissatisfaction regarding the relationship between rectors and the Maintenance and Building Services departments. Lack of communication and unclear delineation of responsibility and authority were cited as reasons for this dissatisfaction.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. The Maintenance Department should assign a Building Supervisor to each residence hall. Depending on the size of the residence hall, each Maintenance Building Supervisor could be responsible for several halls. The Supervisor should make daily visits to the residence hall to ensure that all repair work is in order. This individual would have primary responsibility for maintaining the physical condition of the residence hall.
2. The Office of Student Residences, working closely with Building Services Maintenance, as well as with the Office of Residence Life, should publish a handbook outlining the procedures to be followed by rectors and the Maintenance Building Supervisors with regard to maintenance issues.

Residentiality: Off-Campus Coordinator

There are presently 1532 undergraduate students who live off-campus. Some of these students have chosen to live off-campus, others do so because they were unable to receive on-campus housing. The off-campus experience can be a positive one, fostering important skills for independent living.

However, many off-campus students live in sub-standard housing, in areas plagued by crime. Each year, tensions develop between students and their neighbors, with the local residents upset by large parties and the disruption sometimes caused by students' presence in the neighborhoods.

At a University which emphasizes the importance of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of its students within the context of residential life, care must be taken to extend these values to off-campus students. Greater efforts should be made by the University to address the needs of those living off-campus.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force recommends that a professional staff person be hired as part of the Residence Life staff to serve as a resource person for students living off-campus. This individual's job responsibilities would include assisting students with the adjustment to off-campus living; actively providing information regarding safety and neighborhood relations, as well as about available off-campus housing; serving as a spokesperson for the University in fostering improved relations between students and local residents; serving as a source of assistance and information for students who are victims of off-campus crime or who encounter difficulties with landlords; assisting Campus Ministry in planning weekly liturgies and retreats for off-campus students; acting as a liaison between the Center for Social Concerns and off-campus students; and assisting off-campus students who wish to participate in non-varsity and hall sports.

The Coordinator for Off-Campus Life would also play an important role in assisting transfer students in their adjustment to life at Notre Dame, by providing administrative continuity for the "Adopt-a-Transfer" and other programs aimed at easing the adjustment of transfer students.

RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT

Our discussion of the environment in residence halls has focused on two major topics: intellectual life and standards of conduct for residents.

Intellectual Life

Notre Dame is an academic community, in which scholars commit themselves to learning. If Notre Dame is to promote an intellectual environment among its students, then it must do so in the residence halls, which are the primary centers of student life at the University.

A traditional method of encouraging intellectual life in the halls at Notre Dame has been to hire rectors who also serve as faculty, and to house faculty and administrators in the residence halls. A significant contribution in this area has been made by priests of the Holy Cross community, although the tradition of the bachelor dons is a reminder that laypersons have also fulfilled this function. The Task Force notes that, given the increasing demands on faculty in the University to be involved in teaching and research, it will be difficult to maintain faculty in residence. This will be a special problem for young members of the Holy Cross community, who will bear dual burdens of faculty and residence life.

Over the years, many programs have existed to encourage an intellectual climate in the residence halls. There have been Hall Fellows chosen from the faculty by different residence halls. There have been occasional attempts to offer courses within residence halls. "Take-A-Professor-to-Lunch" sessions and Senior Reflection groups have also been popular. Some of the most rewarding contact occurs on a more informal basis. For example, some faculty members invite students to their homes, and many interact with students through the programs of the Center for Social Concerns.

Moreover, there is at present in each of the halls a student who serves as Academic Commissioner. This commissioner works to bring intellectual dimensions to hall life by, e.g., sponsoring visiting lecturers, arranging faculty-student dinners, and organizing student debates. These commissioners now meet on a bi-weekly basis, so that they may discuss as a group means of promoting intellectual life.

Despite these positive programs aimed at increasing faculty-student interaction as well as the level of participation in the intellectual life on campus, the Task Force notes that there is still much dissatisfaction with the intellectual environment. Specifically, the Task Force wishes to register its concern that the residence halls may be viewed primarily as recreational and social centers and not as an extension of the University's academic community.

One of the difficulties which the Task Force confronted in writing about intellectual life in the halls is that much of our input is based on perceptions of faculty and students. Our evidence here is therefore impressionistic, and it is difficult to base normative conclusions on impressions gathered in an unsystematic way.

Nonetheless, even those perceptions give some insight into the nature of academic life at Notre Dame. Many members of our community believe that students have two lives, or two distinct parts of their lives: one an academic life which is spent mostly in classroom buildings, laboratories, and libraries, and a non-academic life which is spent in dormitories and dining halls where needs are met for food, rest, socialization, and recreation. Only rarely do these parts overlap or intersect. Faculty have two lives: a work life and a home life. The faculty interact with students in the classrooms and laboratories. Faculty come to their work place and enter from peripheral parking lots and leave. Faculty rarely enter "student space", in dining areas, residential halls, or even in chance meetings on the central campus.

Moreover, the perception of many faculty members is that students are so concerned about getting good grades that their intellectual development is overshadowed. On the other hand, many students perceive that faculty members are more interested in publishing than in contact with students. Both faculty and students learn that interaction with students is not "counted" as part of the promotion procedure for faculty. The Task Force is concerned about this lack of reward for faculty who invest a lot of time in students. However, it recognizes that such activities are difficult to quantify for formal review procedures.

Improvement of the intellectual life on campus is an issue involving all sectors of the University and is a topic which will require further discussion from all elements of the University. Our focus on intellectual life in the residence halls leads us to support the following recommendations:

1. We urge the University to encourage faculty and staff residence in the halls. This is especially true in the women's halls, where there are only two women administrators and two Holy Cross priests in residence. In contrast, there are twenty-one Holy Cross priests and brothers who serve as faculty, staff and administrators, in residence in men's dorms. Rooms should be allotted for faculty/staff apartments. This should be kept in mind in the re-design of old facilities and in the construction of new ones.

2. The Task Force recommends that the Hall Fellow, Take-a-Professor-to-Lunch, Academic Commissioners and other programs designed to integrate the residential and intellectual life of the University receive official support from the Office of Student Affairs and/or from the faculty. While we encourage student initiative in these enterprises, official sponsorship would

provide a sense of continuity for these programs. In particular, administrative direction must be given to the Hall Fellow program.

We also encourage the continued regular meeting of the Academic Commissioners; we suggest that more attention be paid to this position in the halls. We urge the appointment of a Faculty Coordinator for the Academic Commissioners.

One model of faculty sponsorship for such programs would be the appointment of a committee consisting of a College Fellow from each college, much like the present College Fellow for the College of Arts and Letters. All fellows should form part of a regular faculty committee which will have input into residential life. Such a committee will also include students, in equal number to faculty appointments.

3. The Task Force recommends that classes be scheduled in the residence halls, which pair students from women's and men's dorms. The major difficulty in sponsoring such classes is the lack of common space in halls, discussed at greater length later in this report.

4. We recommend that the University facilitate faculty and students sharing meals. One of the best ways for faculty and students to continue discussions from class is over meals. Dining hall passes for faculty, similar to those now employed by rectors, should be made available to faculty, at University expense. Moreover, funds should be allotted to dinners and/or parties in the halls to which faculty and administrators and their families could be invited.

Consideration should be given to the design of physical facilities which would enhance student-faculty interaction, i.e., classroom buildings with common dining and lounge areas.

Standards of Student Conduct

There are many ways in which the University of Notre Dame commits itself to education in moral values. One of the main themes which emerged from the Task Force's discussion of the environment of residence halls was the importance of fostering respect for other persons. Rectors, hall staffs and students consistently identified this approach as one of the key goals of residentiality at Notre Dame.

It is the conviction of the Task Force that residence life at Notre Dame must promote and enhance an atmosphere in which persons respect each other as equals, and affirm the dignity of their fellow human beings, in actions as well as words. While we have identified many positive ways in which the residence halls encourage respect for persons, especially in the fine example set by hall staffs, we remain troubled by certain goals of residence life that are insufficiently realized. Particularly disconcerting to Task Force members is evidence that there is significant occurrence in the residence halls of derogatory remarks and prejudicial actions--whether racist, or sexist, or ethnic, or related to sexual orientation. Moreover, at times such attitudes are institutionalized in hall-sponsored events, such as variety shows.

The Task Force recognizes that overcoming such prejudice is an enterprise that requires a sustained effort, over a prolonged period of time, on the part of the entire University community. We add our encouragement to those who have begun to raise the awareness of all members of the Notre Dame community to this problem. As the student population of the University becomes more diverse, it becomes increasingly important to insure that the climate on campus--and in particular in the residence halls--be one which respects and accepts persons of all backgrounds. That is, the University must make concerted attempts to insure that all persons are welcomed as equal residents of the University.

Women at Notre Dame

One of the major changes in residence life in Notre Dame history occurred in 1972, when women entered the University as undergraduates. Since that time, there has been much discussion at Notre Dame of the implications of coeducation for residential life on campus. In examining the relationship of coeducation and residence life at Notre Dame, we were aided by the careful analysis of coeducation at Notre Dame presented in the Report of the Committee to Evaluate Coeducation (Notre Dame Report, #16, May 6, 1977). That report assessed an earlier document central to the history of coeducation at Notre Dame, the Malits Report. Both documents are to be commended for their foresight and for their care in addressing this issue.

The Task Force on Residentiality endorses the vision of coeducation described by this Committee to Evaluate Coeducation. The report reminds readers that:

> Educating men and women together is at the heart of coeducation. Its establishment at the University of Notre Dame is grounded in the recognition that men and women have much to learn from one another. The university setting that best allows the pursuit of truth is a diversified one. It is a microcosm that reflects the world from which it should invite its students and to which they will return. In that microcosm learning is stimulated by the very persons who pursue it--men and women--faculty and students.

A coeducational campus must provide an environment in which men and women can learn from one another. Such learning occurs when they can see each other as equal human beings, when they are no longer blinded by stereotypes about genders. Notre Dame should advocate and render institutional support to promoting positive relationships between women and men. Given the focus on residentiality at Notre Dame, the Task Force concludes that there is no better environment to promote positive relationships between men and women than the residence halls.

One of the best ways to overcome gender stereotypes and to enhance positive relationships between women and men is to bring the number of women and men on campus into parity. We endorse the present plan to enroll 600 additional women as undergraduates. We encourage the University to continue to pay close attention to the number of women enrolled in the interest of achieving its commitment to the equality of men and women.

Unfortunately, Task Force meetings with hall staffs and with students lead us to conclude that, while much has been accomplished in the area of coeducation, residentiality at Notre Dame is not sufficiently supportive of positive male-female interaction at Notre Dame.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force make the following recommendations:

1. We have already noted the low number of women in residence. The Task Force urges the Office of Student Affairs to make more living facilities available on campus for women faculty and administrators.

2. The Task Force affirms a model of collaborative ministry in the University's residence halls, one which recognizes the ministry of laymen and laywomen as well as that of professed religious. We therefore recommend that women and men collaborate in ministry in all residence halls at Notre Dame.

3. Several groups expressed to the Task Force their concern about the role of Holy Cross priests in the residence halls. Various members of the Congregation of Holy Cross on campus expressed their commitment to a residential priestly ministry. That is, they did not want to define their ministry as limited to a sacramental role in hall liturgies. Instead, their concept of ministry emphasized the importance of having Holy Cross priests in residence, where they interact with students. It is by living in residence halls that many members of the Holy Cross community find that they impart the traditions of Holy Cross, and the traditions of Notre Dame, to student residents.

However, such a vision of priests in residence is problematical at a University which is now coeducational. While there are at present two Holy Cross priests in residence in women's halls, Holy Cross has not, to date, committed itself to providing priests-in-residence for women's halls. The Task Force sensed that the Holy Cross community itself is in the midst of coming to a better understanding of its role at a coeducational University. Some Holy Cross members did suggest that it was sufficient for Holy Cross priests to provide a liturgical presence in women's halls, while remaining in residence in men's halls.

The Board of Trustees Student Report on the Residential Life of the Undergraduate Student Body reports this problem as well; it notes that a major weakness of women's residence halls is the absence of ordained priests in residence. Liturgical schedules become difficult for halls in which no priests in residence.

The Task Force agrees that it is an important goal that Holy Cross priests be present in all residence halls at Notre Dame. However, some disagreement existed among Task Force members about the priorities to be followed in realizing this goal. A majority of the Task Force felt that the presence of Holy Cross priests in the residence halls was of utmost importance because their long tradition of residential ministry at Notre Dame had been reaffirmed by a mandate for this ministry from the University Board of Trustees. Therefore, a majority of the Task Force recommends that Student Affairs give first priority to the presence of Holy Cross priests in all of the residence halls.

A minority of Task Force members argues that a recommendation that advocates the movement of Holy Cross priests into women's residence halls undermines the ministerial contributions of women to the residence halls. These members believe that the movement of priests into residence halls should take place only in conjunction with the movement of women into residence in men's halls. They were concerned that if priority is given to the placement of Holy Cross priests in residence, two different models of ministry will emerge: a collaborative model of ministry with men and women in the women's halls, and an all-male model of ministry in the men's halls. Such a situation cannot promote a positive understanding of coeducation in which women's and men's contributions to University residential life are equally valued.

4. The Task Force recommends that more open communication and more positive interaction between female and male rectors be facilitated by the Office of Student Affairs. Both men and women rectors noted that there is at times lack of awareness of women students' concerns by male rectors, and lack of awareness of male students' concerns by women rectors. Moreover, male and female rectors may have different perceptions of what constitutes the major problems they confront in the residence halls. For example, eating disorders are serious worries in women's dorms; male hall staffs may be unaware of the significance of this problem. Or physical violence may be an issue for male

rectors in a way that is not for women rectors. Both sides expressed the need for sustained communication between women's and men's hall staffs.

5. We recommend the planning of more events which pair men and women from different halls. These events should include intellectual, social, and spiritual gatherings, e.g., classes in halls which would pair women and men from neighboring dorms. Women and men's halls could also sponsor lecture series, or hall liturgies and retreats. Such settings could provide a good environment for friendships between women and men students.

6. Questions for the future. The Task Force notes that the Malits Report (later cited by the Committee on Coeducation Report) addressed the importance of hall staffs which would include both men and women. "Recognizing that the mutual interaction and influence of men and women is basic to coeducation, the Malits Committee suggested that consideration be given to hiring married couples as rectors and appointing some women on the staffs of men's halls and vice versa." At present, most of the halls do not have the physical facilities to accommodate married couples as rectors. The Task Force encourages the University to consider the possibility of married rectors when planning new residence halls.

Minority Students at Notre Dame

In February of 1988 the Committee on Minority Students issued a report to the Provost of the University. That report describes many of the difficulties encountered by minority students at Notre Dame, and offers twelve recommendations to improve the position of minorities at the University. The Task Force endorses the conclusions of this committee.

The report urges a Notre Dame commitment to a multicultural environment, arguing that the University's responsibility to the disadvantaged is part of the mission of Notre Dame and would enrich the educational experience at the University. One of the major recommendations of the report concerns increased minority presence at all levels of Notre Dame life, in the student body as well as among faculty, administrators, and staff.

In its section on student and residence life, the report notes some of the problems confronted by minority students. For example, the homogenity of the campus leaves many minority students feeling ill-at-ease, alienated and isolated from the mainstream of university life. The specific passage on residence life states:

> Black students generally say they find residence life at Notre Dame not the positive experience it is intended to be. They feel there is little constructive effort either by residence hall leaders or by students in general to make this an inviting multicultural context... they do not feel that there are clear and open channels if they need to address a sensitive issue.

The Task Force on Residentiality supports both the description of the environment on campus for minority students, as well as the recommendations of the Committee on Minority Students. Our own examination of the role of minorities in residence halls suggests that many minority students do feel alienated from the social--as well as from the religious--culture of the residence halls. (This does vary from group to group, as the committee report suggests.) Lack of minority presence in resident assistant, assistant rector, and rector positions was obvious to minority students, and many of them noted that such absence had a negative impact on their own attitude toward applying for R.A. positions, since they rarely, if ever, encountered a minority member on hall staff.

Two comments by minority students and staff about residence life were especially compelling for committee members. The first dealt with the portance attributed to a significant presence of minority students on campus. Adjustment to residence life was made more readily when a significant community of minority students was already established in a residence hall. The second comment concerned the importance of role models for minority students. Members of minority groups in administrative positions in the halls can encourage students to take on positions of leadership, and can inspire students to believe that they too can be recognized for their accomplishments.

Taking into account the recommendations of the Minority Committee Report, as well as comments made by minority representatives to Task Force members, we make the following recommendations about residence life at Notre Dame:

1. We strongly support the Minority Committee recommendations to bring more minority students and hall staff (along with faculty and administrators) to Notre Dame. Such a presence is necessary to improve the residential life of all students at Notre Dame.

2. We also support the recommendation of special advising for minority students from the time of their arrival here. Our particular concern is that minority students be encouraged in their freshmen year to consider taking on hall staff positions in their senior year. They should also be urged to run for positions in hall government. Counselors should describe hall staff positions and elected offices to them, and encourage them to apply for such positions.

3. We recommend that an appropriate program of minority recruitment for hall staffs, and for the Office of Student Affairs, be devised and implemented by the new administrator of the University's minority plan.

4. We recommend that hall staffs receive as part of their orientation programs specific training on the special needs of minority students at Notre Dame, which includes examination of their own attitudes toward minorities. This should be part of a larger program to raise community awareness and respect for all persons at Notre Dame.

5. Hall facilities--classes in halls, lecture series, group discussions--should include themes which encourage a multicultural environment at Notre Dame. Hall Presidents, Academic Commissioners, and Social Commissioners should be informed of the needs of minority students, and should learn to be responsive to them in the programs offered in the halls.

6. Campus Ministry should continue to make special efforts to meet the religious needs of minority students, many of whom are not Catholic. The ideal is to have a staff person who could meet some of these needs. Campus Ministry should assist in arranging connections between minority students and worship services in South Bend/Mishawaka. Presently, all rectors are provided with information about local, non-Catholic religious services and are asked to make this information accessible to students.

Rules and Regulations

In order to encourage and promote respect for individuals within the Notre Dame community, the University establishes rules and procedures to guide student conduct. These can be found in the student handbook, du Lac: A Guide to Student Life. The opening two sentences set the tone for the entire discussion of student conduct. They state: "If scholars are to dwell together in peace, they will have to live under law. Law can be considered either negatively as a system of repressions ending in punishment; or positively as a rule of reason for the common good."

University rules and procedures as described in du Lac note both positive goals for student conduct as well as prohibitions necessary to community well-being. Therefore, in addition to identifying the communal goals of Notre Dame life, specific rules (and penalties for violations of these rules) are enumerated.

When asked to identify the "most important standard of conduct" or the "most important rule" of residence life at Notre Dame, members of hall staffs as well as members of the Office of Student Affairs, expressed a common belief that respect for self and other persons was the most important guideline for student conduct. All agreed that the specific rules which govern life in the residence halls are designed to foster this respect and to create a positive community atmosphere.

This positive purpose for the rules and regulations at Notre Dame must be emphasized during hall staff orientation and training sessions. In turn, hall staff members must be able to communicate these goals to students in disciplinary situations. Hall staffs should be equipped not only to deal with specific rule violations but also to communicate their broader concerns about the impact of negative behavior on the life of the student.

There is a need for clarity among the hall staffs regarding specific rules and regulations and for consistency in enforcement. In meetings with hall staff personnel, we heard different interpretations of the standards of conduct, even from persons who work together on the same hall staff. There were, for example, differences of opinion about party limits and alcohol standards.

Members of the Task Force are concerned that a positive understanding of the rules which govern life in the residence halls is not being communicated to student residents. Difficulties with the text of du Lac is one reason for this. While positive aspects of residence life are noted, the bulk of student standards refers to actions which are prohibited. Many of the broader goals of student life may be lost among these negative statements.

Moreover, some of the wording of du Lac is ambiguous. This is especially true of the section on parietals. Parietals are linked to the question of coeducation, but the purpose of parietals is left unclear.

Further, there are no established procedures for communicating standards of student conduct to students. While copies of du Lac are distributed to all students, there is no guarantee that students will read the rules, much less discuss their meaning. While discussion of the positive goals of community life may take place in some of the halls, such discussion is left to the initiative of the hall staffs.

The Task Force believes that students will have a more positive sense of community and of respect for others if they develop a sense of participation in hall life, including some participation in the rules by which they are governed.

One method of increasing student participation in hall governance is through the Hall Judicial Board. The disciplinary system should move toward a model in which students take responsibility for formulating and enforcing regulations within the residence halls. Through the Judicial Board, the students have the opportunity to undertake the responsibility of self-governance.

In addition to fostering a sense of self-governance, the boards can offer an educational opportunity which is lost when a disciplinary matter is handled by the rector alone. Peer review may cause students to reflect more carefully upon their unacceptable behavior than would punishment by the rector. Thus, the judicial boards encourage a sense of community and maturity.

Unfortunately, the use of the hall judicial boards is sporadic and in many cases nonexistent. The process of selecting the board chairperson and members varies from hall to hall. The chairperson is usually appointed by the in-coming hall president, the out-going J-Board chairperson, and/or the rector. In many cases, only one of these parties selects the chairperson. The members are usually appointed by the new chairperson.

At present, none of the hall judicial boards receives any formal training to handle its responsibilities. As a result, many rectors are reluctant to give them responsibilities. Also, many rectors do not know how to use the J-Boards. As a result, many J-Boards handle responsibilities only remotely related to hall governance (such as hall storage).

The Judicial Review Board acts as the body to which a student involved in a disciplinary case may appeal a decision made by the hearing officers in the Office of Residence Life. The board is composed of six faculty members and six administrative members, appointed by the President of the University, who serve for a period of one year. Five of the twelve are selected to hear a given appeal. The hearing of the Judicial Review Board is de novo. Decisions of the Judicial Review Board may be appealed to the President of the University.

In light of these concerns, the Task Force recommends:

1. Extensive revision of du Lac should be undertaken. As part of this revision, clear expression should be given for the reasons behind the standards of conduct for students at the University.

The University's introduction of a new academic honor code is an auspicious moment to begin reexamination of the entire understanding of student conduct at the University, linked to a thorough revision of du Lac. Such revision should include an examination of the student codes of conduct at other universities. It should link concern for academic integrity with concern for respect for persons in the residence halls, and join both to a policy encouraging student initiative.

2. The Office of Student Affairs should discuss the positive goals of residence life at Notre Dame with all hall personnel during orientation. We also recommend that each hall staff institute a procedure by which the standards of conduct (in the broad sense) are communicated to students. Halls should determine their own approach, but such a procedure should become part of all students' general orientation.

3. The Office of Residence Life should establish a training program for the Hall Judicial Boards. For the students, such training should include education on the disciplinary philosophy of the University, peer counseling, and recognition of substance abuse problems. For the rectors, such training should include the discussion of the ideal working relationship between the rector and the J-Board. Also, the training should include guidelines for those cases which are too serious or sensitive to be handled by the J-Board.

Furthermore, we recommend that J-Board chairpersons and members be selected through hall elections. The term of office for J-Board members should, in the interest of continuity, be longer than one year.

Finally, we recommend that rectors be encouraged by the Office of Student Affairs to use the judicial boards in handling disciplinary cases and in the formulation of hall regulations.

4. We recommend that the process of appeal to the Judicial Review Board be reviewed with an overhaul of the entire system in mind. Such a review should be undertaken by a committee composed of some members of the Office of Residence Life, former Judicial Review Board members, and students who have served on Hall Judicial Boards, with input from faculty members and rectors.

Specific areas of inquiry should include the process used in selecting Judicial Review Board members, duration of service on the board, training for members, grounds for appeal, and length of time allowed for the appeals process.

FACILITIES

In light of the respected tradition of residentiality at the University and the large number of students in residence, we have a special opportunity to promote the spiritual, social, intellectual and moral growth of students through the residence halls. The halls have become a focus of much of student life, as students study, worship and socialize within the halls. Because of the unique opportunities for growth offered to students there, it is the conviction of the Task Force that the opportunity to participate in the residential life at Notre Dame is integral to the education of our students.

The University is presently unable to accommodate all of those students who seek on-campus housing. While the number of students on the waiting list fluctuates from semester to semester, an average of 150 students, both men and women, await on-campus housing at any given time. As a general rule, the Office of Student Residences is able to accommodate men seeking on-campus housing more quickly than women, due to a higher rate of attrition among men. The waiting period for men is generally 1 1/2 semesters. The 1987-88 academic year has proven to be the exception to this rule; Student Residences has been unable to place any of the 127 men presently on the waiting list.

In past years, the waiting period for women seeking on-campus housing has been two years. Upon the completion of Knott and Siegfried Halls in the spring of 1988, most of the women currently on the waiting list will be offered on-campus housing, and the number of women on the waiting list should decrease dramatically in subsequent years. However, on the basis of the projected increase in the number of undergraduate women to be admitted, these new residence halls may not provide a long-term solution to the problem of providing housing to our female students.

A discussion of the needs of those students groups most directly affected by the shortage of on-campus housing follows:

Transfer Students:

The majority of those awaiting on-campus housing are transfer students. Only sophomores and juniors are accepted as transfers and all transfer students are admitted in August. The number of transfer students admitted varies from year to year, depending upon the number of available openings in the college to which they apply and upon certain financial considerations. Because the number of transfer students varies each year, it is a difficult task to plan for housing these students on campus.

While most transfer students express pleasure and satisfaction at their acceptance to Notre Dame, they acknowledge a sense of regret at the prospect of missing an important aspect of the Notre Dame experience, namely sharing in the life of the residence halls. In many instances, their academic and social adjustment is complicated by the lack of on-campus housing.

Freshmen Students:

The number of freshmen students assigned to study lounges has increased dramatically over the last two years, totalling over 100 students each year in 1986 and 1987. As soon as space becomes available, these freshmen are assigned to rooms. In some instances, this may not occur until the beginning of the Spring semester. Meanwhile, these students develop friendships with their roommates in the study lounges and begin to identify with the hall in which they are living. Their reassignment to a new hall and to a new roommate can be difficult in a year already filled with adjustments. At the same time, the rest of the hall residents suffer from the loss of study space.

Fifth Year Students

Those undergraduates who are enrolled in University-approved five year programs of study, such as the Architecture or Arts & Letters/ Engineering Programs, lose their housing privileges at the end of their fourth year. They are granted the right to place their names on the waiting list, but generally do not receive on-campus housing because of the length of that list.

Discussions regarding the quantity of available on-campus housing must necessarily be coupled with issues regarding the quality of life in our residence halls. Life in the residence halls has changed dramatically over the last twenty years. The Notre Dame student of today has far more material possessions than his or her counterpart of the 1960's. Students come to us accustomed to a different life style, one of greater activity and mobility. The physical space in our residence halls has not kept pace with the needs of our students. Many of the older residence halls were designed and built during a time when students' lives were simpler and their needs fewer. The Task Force recognizes the urgent need for living and common space.

The Task Force defines "common space" not merely as space where students can gather to socialize, but also as space for study and class meetings, for the celebration of liturgy and meetings of reflection groups, for kitchen and food sales facilities, and for laundry and storage areas. The need for additional common space has begun to be addressed in the residence halls which have been constructed in the last five years. However, the need for expanding living and social space in the older residence halls remains critical.

In our commitment to provide students with an environment conducive to their social, spiritual and academic growth, the provision of adequate living and common space is essential. The Task Force recommends, therefore, that a study be undertaken immediately to examine the adequacy of living and common space available to each residence hall. Where necessary, the number of students in a given hall should be reduced and the construction of common space should be undertaken. Hall staffs should play an integral role in the study of each hall, so that the needs of the residents may be adequately addressed.

To address the housing needs of transfer students, freshmen, and fifth year students, or to attempt to remedy the problem of overcrowding and lack of common space in the older residence halls without reference to the total housing picture is to solve one problem and to create another. While it would, for example, be possible to provide all transfer students with on-campus housing, this could not be accomplished without displacing another group whose need for on-campus housing is equally acute or whose presence in our halls is of equal importance. The Task Force discussed a number of options, including a Senior lottery, but did not find any of these solutions satisfactory.

In addressing these difficult and complex issues, the Task Force has concluded that the solution lies in the construction of additional residence halls. We make this recommendation in the conviction that the opportunity to participate in the residential life at Notre Dame is integral to the education of our students. Because of the importance of residential life within the educational mission of the university, we urge the University to make the provision of on-campus housing for all students who desire it a priority.

The Task Force is cognizant of the commitment of resources that is necessary for such an undertaking and that there is financial risk involved in the decision to construct additional residence halls. While the demand for additional housing has been consistent over the last several years, the possibility exists that due to changes in the economic or social climate, students might at some point in the future prefer off-campus living, resulting in an overabundance of on-campus housing.

In the past, the University's housing policy has reflected a commitment to full occupancy. From an economic standpoint, full occupancy of the existing residence halls represents the most efficient use of these halls. The greater the number of students who can be housed at any given level of capital investment in housing, the lower the per student cost of housing will be. In an age of escalating tuition and other costs, the Task Force acknowledges the need to contain costs wherever possible. Given the uncertainties which inhere in estimating the on-campus housing requirements each semester, a certain amount of "underbooking" or "overbooking" is bound to occur during some semesters. However, some balancing must necessarily occur between the need to control costs and to provide students with the opportunity to participate in an integral part of the Notre Dame educational experience.

In the final analysis, the Task Force believes that the University should strive to fulfill the ideal of accommodating every undergraduate student who desires to live on-campus. Given the present size of the student body, the Task Force recommends construction of sufficient additional dormitory rooms to eliminate the placement of freshmen in study lounges and to provide transfer and fifth year students with the opportunity for on-campus housing. The Task Force urges that no expansion of the student body occur in the future without an accompanying expansion of housing and services to resident students.

Innovative planning might minimize some of the risks involved in the construction of additional residence halls. For example, a housing facility could be constructed which would accommodate both seniors and graduate students, with the senior students having priority. In those semesters in which the demand among seniors for on-campus housing decreases, more rooms would be made available to graduate students. In this manner, both the goals of full occupancy and the provision of on-campus housing to undergraduates could be achieved.

Should the construction of one or more additional residence halls be undertaken, consideration should be given to making one of the new facilities coresidential in nature. The Task Force affirms the traditional all-male and all-female residence hall as the primary residential model at Notre Dame. As expressed by the Committee on Coeducation, "the opportunities for interaction among women and among men are as important to the development of students as the opportunities for interaction between the two groups. Coming to a full sense of one's womanhood, or manhood, requires time and privacy with other women or men as does the development of deep and enduring friendship among one's own."

At the same time, a majority of the Task Force shares the Coeducation Committee's view that "no single model can serve the needs of all. There are students who may best learn the art of interaction when relaxed residential arrangements not only allow but actually cause the natural mingling of men and women. In coresidential living, hall government, common projects and social events create the need for women and men to deal with one another...".

The majority of the Task Force believes that coresidential housing should be made an optional arrangement for residents at Notre Dame. However, such an option must be understood and implemented within the larger context of the goals of residential life and the educational mission of the University.

While the notion of coresidential housing facility has been raised in the past, the Task Force believes that honest, constructive dialogue between students, administrators, faculty, parents and alumni has yet to occur on this issue. We recommend that a committee be established whose sole purpose will be to consider the possibility of a coresidential housing facility and to engage these groups in dialogue. The term "coresidential living" embraces many possible models, and it would be the task of this committee to develop a model consistent with Notre Dame's concept of residential life.

The Task Force has discussed three possible models, none of which we found entirely satisfactory, but which we share as a starting point for discussion for the committee appointed to study this issue.

The first model involves the construction of a small complex of senior townhouses, housing no more than 200 students. While the townhouses would allow senior students to develop skills required for successful independent living, there would be a strong communal aspect to life in the townhouses. The design for the townhouses would include common social and study space, and a chapel area. Senior men and women could reside in the townhouses, provided the design would adequately provide for the privacy of each apartment unit. The same code of conduct which governs life in the other residence halls would apply to senior townhouses, including parietal regulations and the Alcohol Policy.

The second model we discussed closely resembled that first suggested by the Committee on Coeducation. This model calls for separate living facilities for men and women with ordinary areas common to both, such as social rooms, chapel space, lobby areas, laundry rooms, food sales and mailboxes, similar to the present configuration of Keenan and Stanford Halls. Parietal regulations would apply and only juniors and seniors would be eligible for residence.

The third model involved a kind of "honors hall", housing no more than 75 to 100 students. Only upperclassmen would be eligible for residence, and the criteria for selection would include academic achievement, demonstrated leadership and a commitment to community life. The code of student conduct found in du Lac would apply, but there would be some degree of self governance among the residents.

Handicapped Students

The University of Notre Dame continues to make a conscious effort to accommodate its handicapped students. There are forty handicapped students enrolled at present. Five students use wheelchairs while most of the others have sight or hearing disabilities. Although the number of handicapped students is small, their needs are extremely important and their presence at Notre Dame serves to educate other students about the needs and capabilities of the handicapped. It is essential that these students be made to feel part of the Notre Dame family.

Most of the buildings on campus were constructed before we, as a society, acknowledged the needs of the handicapped, and consequently most are not accessible to handicapped persons. St. Edward's, Pasquerilla East and Pasquerilla West are the only residence halls on campus equipped with adequate ramps, elevators, and lavatory facilities for the handicapped. Even in the Pasquerillas, however, handicapped residents face serious obstacles; with no student rooms on the first floor, a power outage during a fire in which the elevators would not operate could be disastrous. Knott and Siegfried Halls are being constructed according to the Pasquerilla model.

Housing for handicapped graduate students is inadequate at present. There are no male graduate halls accessible to graduate students and the present halls cannot be made accessible. The University has made a special effort to accommodate the two male graduate students currently enrolled who use wheelchairs. In one such case, the University converted a unit in the O'Hara-Grace complex into an apartment equipped for a handicapped person; in the other, a University-owned house in South Bend was ramped and equipped for handicapped living. As graduate enrollment increases, it is likely the number of handicapped graduate students will also increase. Provisions should be made to house these students.

Access to our residence halls is an issue not only with regard to our handicapped students but also with respect to handicapped family members and friends. A handicapped parent should have the same opportunities to visit his or her child's room as a non-handicapped parent.

In light of the above concerns, the Task Force recommends an immediate study of all residence halls with regard to accessibility and safety of the handicapped. We recommend that efforts be made to accommodate the needs of the handicapped in the existing dorms and that the needs of the handicapped be a priority in the construction of new residence halls as well sa in all University facilities.

Graduate Student Housing

At present, graduate enrollment at Notre Dame totals 1,929 students. Approximately twenty percent of all graduate students reside in University-owned housing. The demands for housing exceed the capabilities of the present facilities. Each year, over one hundred graduate students request and are denied on-campus housing.

In light of the University's expressed commitment to increase graduate enrollment, there is an urgent need for additional University-provided graduate housing. In discussing graduate housing, it is important to consider the diverse needs of the graduate population, which includes single, married and foreign students.

a. Single Students

Currently there are two halls on campus for single graduate men, St. Joseph and Brownson Halls. All of the rooms in these halls are single rooms. St. Joseph houses 72 students while Brownson accommodates 37. St. Joseph and Brownson do offer graduate men a convenient, affordable housing option. However, according to the Graduate Student Housing Survey completed in the Fall of 1987, the residents of these halls are unhappy with the substandard condition of the halls and the lack of maintenance. Similar complaints were voiced by some hall staff members.

The O'Hara-Grace townhouses are available to single graduate women, currently housing 134 students. Each townhouse has four bedrooms with residents sharing kitchen and living space. Some residents have expressed concern about a lack of privacy and about the difficulties inherent in living with three other women whose schedules and life styles may be very different. According to the graduate student survey, many residents also expressed concern about a perceived lack of security.

b. Married Students

Married graduate students (as well as married undergraduates) may reside in University Village. There are 108 two-bedroom units available to those couples with children, 24 one-bedroom units available for couples without children. The primary advantage of living in University Village is the affordability of housing. There is a waiting list for apartments, with an average waiting period of one semester for couples with children, one year for those with no children. Like the residents of St. Joseph and Brownson Halls,University Village residents express unhappiness with the condition of the apartments and the lack of maintenance.

c. Foreign Students

While foreign students are included in the above categories, attention must be focused on their special needs. Of the 1,929 graduate students, 344 are foreign students. In many instances, these students face social and cultural as well as academic adjustments. For some language is a barrier. It is difficult enough for most students to find safe, affordable, convenient housing off campus; for foreign students facing the obstacles of language and culture, it becomes nearly impossible. At present, no special priority is given to foreign students with respect to on-campus housing.

In light of the above concerns, the Task Force makes the following recommendations with regard to graduate facilities:

1. The University should undertake immediately the construction of additional housing facilities for graduate students, both married and single. According to the Graduate Student Union Survey, a majority of students expressed a preference for one or two-bedroom apartments over dormitory singles, efficiencies or larger apartments. Consideration should be given to this model.

2. The University should improve living conditions for those students currently residing in St. Joseph and Brownson Halls as well as in University Village.

3. We recommend the creation of a position within the Office of Student Residences which would have as one of its primary areas of responsibility the provision of services to graduate students. This individual would be responsible for centralizing and coordinating the housing application process for students, ensuring adequate maintenance of the residence halls, and would serve as an important resource for the graduate hall staffs. As the number of graduate facilities increases in the future, the need for such a position becomes even more critical.

4. We recommend that serious consideration be given to making the provision of on-campus housing to foreign students a priority.

5. Any new graduate facility should be made fully accessible to handicapped persons.

Residential Environment: Graduate Living

The Task Force has devoted considerable time to defining Notre Dame's model of residential life with its commitment to foster students' spiritual, moral, intellectual and social growth. We have affirmed the importance of an environment in our residence halls which encourages intellectual pursuits, integrity, virtue and personal development, spiritual awareness and growth, as well as friendship among students.

These are the goals of residence life at Notre Dame in graduate as well as undergraduate facilities. However, the method by which we attempt to achieve these goals must be adapted in the graduate facilities to the needs and interests of our graduate population. Graduate students come to us from a wide variety of educational backgrounds and life experiences. Their needs and interests differ from those of undergraduates in many respects. Care must be taken to identify and address the needs of graduate students.

Several important questions arise when considering the application of Notre Dame's model of residential life to graduate living. First, it is necessary to define the role and responsibility of hall staff members in graduate facilities. Should hall staff members take the pastoral approach which we encourage rectors in undergraduate halls to take, seeking to become actively involved in the students' lives? Secondly, there is a need to examine the code of conduct which applies to graduate students. Presently, the provisions of du Lac are equally applicable to undergraduate and graduate students. Is there a need to develop and implement a separate code of conduct for graduate students? Finally, it would be important to determine the level of interest among graduate students in sharing a residential experience. Are they interested in becoming part of a residential community or do they view a strong communal aspect as unnecessary or an interference with their privacy?

The Task Force believes that the question of the role graduate students play within the residential mission of Notre Dame has yet to be addressed by the University. Therefore, we recommend the immediate appointment of a committee consisting of graduate students, faculty and staff, to consider these issues fully and to formulate concrete recommendations in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The Task Force affirms the strong tradition of residentiality at Notre Dame. The opportunities for intellectual, moral, social and spiritual growth offered to students within our residential system are integral to the educational mission of the University.

Over the course of its eleven-month study of residentiality at Notre Dame, the Task Force was convinced of the strength and health of our residential system. At the same time, where need was identified, we have offered concrete recommendations for improvement.

Residential life has been one of the hallmarks of life at the University of Notre Dame since its earliest days. As Notre Dame looks to the future, the Task Force urges the University to reaffirm its commitment to residential life.

notre dame report

An official publication of the University of Notre Dame, Department of Public Relations and Information. Individual copies are available in the Notre Dame Hammes Bookstore at 50 cents each. Mail subscriptions are $10 per year. Back copies are available through the mail at 70 cents each.

Darlene Cutrona, Editor
John Furnari, Layout

Publications and Graphic Services
415 Administration Building
Notre Dame, Ind. 46556
(219) 239-5337